

The Classical Review

APRIL 1893.

THE GALLIAMBIC METRE.

To the theory of the Galliambic metre propounded by Professor Tyrrell in the February number of the *Classical Review*, namely that it is antispastic in character, the first half of the line being iambic in rhythm, the latter trochaic, there appear to me to be two serious and, if I may say so with modesty, fatal objections. For an antispastic metre to be effective the new rhythm must start with absolute clearness, and contradict at once the impression produced by the old. But this is not the case in the Galliambic line on account of (1) the caesura, which comes in the first (assumed) trochaic foot, and (2) the fact that this foot is never a pure trochee, but always a dactyl or a spondee. It is hard not to see in the two short syllables after the caesura the commencement of a fresh iambic rhythm with *anacrusis* exactly parallel to the first half of the line.

I am glad to gather from Prof. Tyrrell's paper that the belief in an Ionic a minore basis (with *anacclasis*) as the origin of the metre is now abandoned. It was absurd, on the face of it, to suppose that an effect of syncopated time could be maintained twice in each line so as to be effective to the ear, in a poem of 93 lines, with only three doubtful places (now all corrected) to sustain the original rhythm. And yet so recent an authority as Dr. Gleditsch in I. Müller's *Handbuch* adheres to the old doctrine.

I believe that the account of the metre given by Mr. Grant Allen is the only satisfactory one. The first half of the line is

Anacreontic. This verse in Anacreon's hands may possibly have originated from an Ionic a minore rhythm by *anacclasis*; but this was forgotten by his later imitators, and I do not believe it affected Catullus in the least. The first half of his line has in fact a pretty close kinship with the first half of the Saturnian. The latter half of course is totally different.

I have now only to add one point to Mr. Grant Allen's explanation. No account of any Latin metre can be complete that does not take into account the influence of the Latin accent. It is this more than anything else that makes of every Latin metre a different thing from its Greek prototype. A short examination makes clear the fact that in the first half of the Galliambic line the accent generally coincides with the ictus. We have this exemplified in the line (63) which Prof. Tyrrell selects for emendation:

ego mulier ego adulēscens.

(We may scan *ēgō mūliēr* or *ēgō mūljēr* according to choice.)

In the second half of the line conflict between accent and ictus prevails. Apart from any resolution of feet some difference of this kind between the two halves of the line might be expected. But it may be shown, I think, that this difference is increased by the resolution of the second foot that prevails in the last half. We have a large number of second half-lines of the type *cēlerē rātē mārīā*, where the accent (') never coincides with the ictus (˘). It is in

So verses 2, 3, 6, 10, 11, 12, 13, 16, 18, 19, 20, 21, 24, 25, 28, 29, 32, 33, 36, 38, 39, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 61, 62, 65, 66, 71, 72, 75, 79, 80, 81, 82, 84, 85, 87, 88, 89, 90, 92, 93.

The two introductory shorts are of course an anacrusis (according to this view) and may be represented by one long; thus, (v. 5)

devolvit ille acuta sibi pondera silice.

So vv. 7, 15, 17, 26, 40, 67.

The first trochee may be resolved into a tribrachys; thus (v. 4)

Ibi maria vasta visens lacrimantibus oculis.
So vv. 23, 70.

Or the first trochee may be represented by an irrational dactyl (v. 22)

Tibicen ubi canit Phryx curvo grave calamo.

where the fourth foot is an irrational spondee—a common phenomenon in logaoedic verse.

The second trochee may be resolved into a tribrachys; thus (v. 4)

Stimulatus ubi ferenti rabie vagus animi.

So vv. 27, 30, 31, 63, 69, 77, 78, 91; or, may be represented by an irrational dactyl (v. 54): et earum ut omnia adirem, &c.

Irrational spondees occur in the following lines:

v. 22. Tibicen ubi canit Phryx curvo grave calamo.

v. 34. Rapidæ ducem sequuntur Gallæ pede propero.

v. 37. Figer his labantes languore oculos sopor operit.

v. 74. Roseis ut huic labellis palans sonitus abiit.

A few troublesome lines must now be examined.

v. 60. Abero foro palaestra stadio et gymnasiis.

Perhaps we should read *atque gymnasiis*. The *y* of *gymnasiis* is probably short, as in Progne, cygnus, &c.

v. 9. Tympanum tubam Cybelles, tua mater, initia;

where the *y* is probably short, as in *gymnasiis*.

v. 68. Ego ne Deum ministra et Cybeles famula ferar.

Here we have seemingly an anacrusis of a single short, which is perhaps admissible but unlikely, and some editors insert *heu*. As regards v. 91 the original reading may be defended, namely,

Dea magna, Dea Cybelle dea, domina Dindimi,

which closely approximates to v. 35:

Itaque ut domum Cybelles tetigere lassulae.

In logaoedic measures, sporadic modifications of the prevailing type need not be deprecated or excite surprise. It is sufficient to indicate their rhythmic conformity to this type.

Although the mother-form is

the prevailing type is, as I have shown by an enumeration of the verses,

and it is particularly interesting to observe that in the verse last quoted,

Itaque ut domum Cybelles tetigere lassulae, the generating trochee takes the place of the tribrachys, so as to express languor. A tribrachys here would have jarred with the sentiment.

We may now combine these results, indicating the variations of form:



We thus obtain a scheme which, I venture to think, solves all the difficulties of the metre, and reconstitutes the musical form of a presumed Greek original.

It remains now to give its analysis. The metre obviously consists of two kola, the trisemic syllable closing the first kolon; thus

Super alta vectus At|tis celeri rate maria.

The first kolon is a trochaic or logaoedic tripod, the second a logaoedic or trochaic tetrapody. The traditional designation of the former is Logaoedic Prosodiacon, and is thus very appropriate to a poem modelled possibly upon a processional song of Galli. It is equivalent to such forms as

ᾄδ' Ἄρτεμις, ὦ κόραι,
φείγοισα τὸν Ἀλφεῖόν.

The latter kolon is the First Glyconeion.

It is to be observed that the want of balance between the two kola (one a tripod, the other a tetrapody) well suits the wild and frenzied tone of feeling expressed by the poem.

This precise combination is not uncommon. Thus:

Pind. *Olym.* iv. 23—

ἔειπεν Ὑψιπελεία μετὰ στέφανον ἰών.
⋮⋮⋮ ⋮⋮⋮ ⋮⋮⋮ ⋮⋮⋮ ⋮⋮⋮ ⋮⋮⋮

Pyth. viii. 6—

τὸ γὰρ τὸ μαλθακὸν ἔρξαι τε καὶ παθεῖν ὁμῶς
⋮⋮⋮ ⋮⋮⋮ ⋮⋮⋮ ⋮⋮⋮ ⋮⋮⋮ ⋮⋮⋮

Nem. iv. 3—

Μοισῶν θύγατρ' αἰοῖδαι θέλξαν νιν ἀπτόμεναι.
⋮⋮⋮ ⋮⋮⋮ ⋮⋮⋮ ⋮⋮⋮ ⋮⋮⋮ ⋮⋮⋮

Eur. Iph. Aul. 1041—

μελωδοῖς Θέτιν ἀχίμασι τὸν τ' Αἰακίδα.
⋮⋮⋮ ⋮⋮⋮ ⋮⋮⋮ ⋮⋮⋮ ⋮⋮⋮ ⋮⋮⋮

Such then is the analysis of the Galli-ambic metre which I submit to the judgment of those interested in this difficult and intricate subject.

G. DUNN.

Edinburgh.

THE 'PROSPECTIVE SUBJUNCTIVE.'

AFTER reading carefully Prof. Sonnenschein's article with the above heading, in the last number of the *Classical Review*, I am still at a loss to know wherein the discovery consists. That the Present Subjunctive refers regularly to future time, that the Imperfect Subjunctive in Consecutive and Final Sentences denotes an action 'future in the past,' are surely facts known to every schoolboy; and Prof. Sonnenschein really cannot be allowed to claim the now universally accepted doctrine of Conditional Sentences as his own discovery. The idea that the Tenses of the Subjunctive in Conditional Sentences represent 'degrees of probability' has long since faded into the limbo of exploded grammatical heresies: the true view, which was clearly expounded by Prof. Sonnenschein in this *Review* in 1887, was taught me by Mr. A. H. Cooke at Cambridge many years before, and has, I should imagine, been long known to every grammatical scholar. Again with regard to sentences like *si fractus illabatur orbis Impavidum ferient ruinae*, no one doubts that they are 'perfectly classical'; but strict grammarians will still contend that

they belong logically to the class of 'mixed conditional sentences.'

In Temporal Clauses introduced by *antequam*, *donec*, etc., Prof. Sonnenschein thinks that 'the commonly received doctrine that the Subjunctive denotes purpose, is too narrow.' But, in the first place we must reply that no scholar supposes that the idea of purpose is always present in Livy and later writers, while even in Cicero it is often only faintly suggested. (This is clearly stated e.g. in the *Eton Latin Grammar*, p. 325.) The examples given by Prof. Sonnenschein add nothing to this statement. The two which he quotes from Plautus and Livy—*confugiamus priusquam leno veniat* and *antequam se hostes ex terrore recipere, ad oppidum contendit* (= 'before they could have time to' etc.) are to my mind clearly Final; and in *Cic. pro Balbo* § 18, Dr. Reid's note appears to me to be right. The list of examples which follows must be taken in detail. I will refer to them by the numbers in order to save space. (1) is Final, as explained in the *Eton Latin Grammar*, p. 325, 'before they could have time to hear of my arrival.'

(2) contains a doubtful reading. For myself, I believe that *deserat* would be impossible in Horace, though some may prefer to suppose that it is an anticipation of the post-Augustan use (so Wilkins *ad loc.*). (3) is virtual oratio obliqua. (4) is an acknowledged crux. I agree on the whole with Prof. Sonnenschein's explanation, that it is similar to the use of the Fut. Perf. in *ergo* (*I ego certe meum officium praestitero*, but do not see that any doctrine of the Subjunctive can be based upon it. So with (5). (6) and (7) merely illustrate the familiar rule that the verbs in a narrative of past events are historic in past tenses. (8)—(12) all fall under the same head, and raise an interesting question. In the *Eton Latin Grammar* (p. 315) we wrote, 'In certain Verbs and Phrases which express the Subjunctival ideas of possibility, right, duty, power, etc. the Indicative may be substituted for the Hypothetical Subjunctive; the reason being, that when the hypothetical notion is sufficiently expressed by the meaning of the verb or phrase, the Subjunctive is felt to be unnecessary. The chief of these are the Indicative of *possum*, *debeo*, *oportet*, *licet*, and the Indicative of *sum* with Future Participle or Gerundive, or with *par*, *rectum*, *iustum*, *idoneum*, *aequum*, *melius* etc.; and with *longum est* etc.' I should have thought that this extremely common idiom was familiar to all readers of Latin; it is therefore very strange to me that Prof. Sonnenschein should choose to ignore it, both here and in others of his grammatical notes. In (8) and (9) indeed he gives the only possible explanation as a rejected alternative, but in (10) he does not even suggest it, and in (11) he rejects Mr. Hallam's perfectly correct translation on the ground that the verb is *erat* not *fuit*. What, I wonder, would he make of such lines as *emendaturus, si licuisset, eram* (Ovid): does *licuisset* there refer to the future? Or in the passage given itself, how can *si moreretur* = 'should he die,' after the past verb *stabat*? The same misunderstanding ('we should rather expect *potuit*') recurs in (12). And yet Cicero writes *ad mortem iam pridem te duci oportebat* (not *oportuit*), which shows how far this notion about the Tenses is from being true. The same objection must be made to a note in Prof. Sonnenschein's edition of Plautus *Rudens* (l. 1021) where he quotes Pl. *Bacch.*

563 *quid? tibi non erat copia nisi occiperes?* as a parallel example to *si fractus illabatur* etc. But *tibi non erat copia* = *non poteras*, and comes under the rule given above. Still more certainly is Sen. *Dial.* 6, 22. 6 (which figures in the same note) an example of this idiom. The words are—*si vivere vellet Seianus, rogandus erat*: which is exactly like Cicero's *si verum respondere velles, haec erant dicenda*. To proceed: I fail to see the relevancy of (13), which is a perfectly ordinary Deliberative Subjunctive. (14) is an interesting example; but if Prof. Sonnenschein means that without the *tanta* *ut* the sentence would run *constringebat si posset*, I cannot agree with him. (15) may be like *si fractus illabatur*: no one denies that such sentences are common. (16) *Regulus, I imagine, said si non peream, perniciēs veniat*. The tense is due to the historic main verb. In (17) the apodosis is not exactly 'suppressed,' but is represented by the substantive *iram* which = *ne senatus irasceret*. The pluperfect corresponds to the fut. perf. in primary sequence—*nisi parvero, senatus iratus erit*. Prof. Sonnenschein's explanation is surprising—can he suppose that *timebat* is the apodosis of *paruisset*, or that any other tense than the pluperfect would be good Latin at all? The last four examples may all be explained by the principles already laid down.

Lastly, we may consider the passage in Horace (*Odes* iii. 6, 37—43) which forms the text of this discourse. Most scholars have been accustomed to call *ubi mutaret* 'iterative,' and I can see no reason for not accepting this view. Prof. Sonnenschein objects that Horace nowhere else uses *ubi* with Subjunctive. Doubtless he does not; but Livy does often, e.g. in the following passage, which no ingenuity can interpret as referring to the future. If Livy can write *consilium adhibendo, ubi res posceret, priores erant*, why should not Horace say *ubi mutaret* = 'whenever it changed'? The construction is common in Livy and Tacitus; why should not an anticipation of it be found in Horace?

In conclusion, I cannot see that Prof. Sonnenschein has made out any case for modifying the classification of the Subjunctive which is to be found in the best Grammars.

W. R. INGE.

AESCHYLUS, *AGAMEMNON* 560-563.

μόχθους γὰρ εἰ λέγοιμι καὶ δυσανλίας
σπαρνὺς παρήξεις καὶ κακοστρώτους τί δ' οὐ
στένοντες οὐ λαχόντες ἡματος μέρος
τὰ δ' αὖτε χέρσῳ κ.τ.λ.

I print this difficult passage without stops. That τὰ δ' αὖτε χέρσῳ begins a new sentence there can be no doubt. A full stop, either interrogative or not interrogative, should be placed after μέρος. It appears to me to be quite certain that lines 560-2 refer to sea troubles, with no hint of the land: τὰ δ' αὖτε χέρσῳ shows this. There is however in these lines (apart from the inexplicable παρήξεις) no word with a flavour of the sea; and δυσανλίας has a flavour of the land (unless any one will be bold enough to say that there is a pun and that we are to think of the time when 'the fleet at Aulis lay enchained'). It is impossible to understand μόχθους in line 560 of labour at sea, unless δυσανλίας 'suffer a sea change.' Even if παρήξεις meant 'berths' it would come too late to give μόχθους the sense we want. Therefore δυσανλίας must be wrong. I cannot find any plausible emendation, but I will propose δυσκυμίας for purpose of illustration.

The most important matter is the construction of 561-562 and the meaning of ἡματος μέρος. The phrase recurs, as I believe, in Plutarch, *De Def. Or.* p. 414A. One of the two best MSS. has there ἡμέρας μέρος, and it is significant that this violates the law of the hiatus. The others have μέρος ἡμέρας. In a forthcoming edition of this treatise I have ventured to print ἡματος μέρος. There is no doubt about the meaning of the phrase in Plutarch's prose. It is almost the same as ἔργον ἡμέρας, 'a day's job.' Plutarch, I think, took the phrase from Aeschylus. Aeschylus took it from common parlance. ἡματος μέρος is 'a big part of a day,' 'a long time.' If I am right in this matter (and the fact that this explanation struck me

and commended itself to Mr. Verrall, when I was still ignorant of the reading ἡμέρας μέρος for μ. ἡμ. in the Plutarch MS., induces me to think I am), then there can be no doubt about the construction and punctuation of the passage in the *Agamemnon*. ἡματος μέρος is the apodosis: τί δ' οὐ στένοντες οὐ λαχόντες is an interjection not subordinated to the rest of the construction. There remains the word παρήξεις, to which no intelligible sense can be assigned. I would read τ' ἀρήξεις and understand ἀρηξίς as equivalent to βοήθεια in its medical sense 'relief from toil,' or 'rest.' The whole passage should then, I think, be written thus

μόχθους γὰρ εἰ λέγοιμι καὶ δυσανλίας
(-κυμίας?),
σπαρνὰς τ' ἀρήξεις καὶ κακοστρώτους—τί δ'
οὐ
στένοντες οὐ λαχόντες—ἡματος μέρος.
τὰ δ' αὖτε κ.τ.λ.

I cannot agree with Mr. Verrall that οὐ λαχόντες is subordinate to στένοντες. This seems to me a construction far more artificial than this interjectional phrase can bear. In στένοντες we have the groaning before the mast or at the oars expressed, in οὐ λαχόντες we have the want of home comforts expressed: τί οὐ depends on both participles στένοντες and οὐ λαχόντες. Thus στένοντες refers to the μόχθοι, οὐ λαχόντες to the σπαρνὰ ἀρήξεις because they were σπαρνὰ κακοστρώτοι. I should paraphrase the whole thus: 'Were I to tell of their toil at the oars and sails, and their trouble on the deep, and of their rare and uneasy moments of repose from this toil and trouble—groaning their souls out when they laboured and grumbling them in when they rested—it would take me most part of the day.'

W. R. PATON.

EURIPIDEAN NOTES. (I.)

Eurip. *Suppl.* 232-237.

νέοις παραχθείς, οἵτινες τιμώμενοι
χαίροντι πολέμους τ' αἰξάνουσ' ἀνεν δίκης,
φθείροντες ἀστούς, ὁ μὲν ὅπως στρατηλατῇ,
ὁ δ' ὡς ὑβρίζῃ δύνανιν ἐς χεῖρας λαβῶν,
ἄλλος δὲ κέρδους οἶνεκ', οὐκ ἀποσκοπῶν
τὸ πλῆθος εἰ τι βλάπτεται πᾶσιν τάδε.

This passage is interesting as an illustration of a feature common to Euripides and Thucydides, though by no means confined to them—the use of synonymous constructions which to their minds were evidently entirely equivalent. We have here three expressions of finality: (1) ὅπως

στρατηλατῇ, (2) ὡς ὑβρίξῃ, (3) κέρδους οὐνεκα = ὡς (ὅπως) κερδαίνῃ. Cf. such passages as Thuc. i. 37, 4 (οὐχ ἵνα μὴ ξυναδικήσωσιν—, ἀλλ' ὅπως—ἀδικῶσι, καὶ ὅπως—βιάζωνται), i. 73, 1 (οὐ—ἀντεροῦντες—, ἀλλ' ὅπως μὴ—βουλεύσῃσθε, καὶ ἅμα βουλόμενοι—δηλωσαί). The feature of style just noted, which is but one phase of a more general characteristic—a constant striving to vary the form of expression—is far-reaching in Thucydides and has been rightly described by Mahaffy, as it appears in the speeches, as 'a crowding of curious and distorted aphorisms about some leading idea, which is reiterated in all sorts of forms.' I cannot accept Wilamowitz' view, that the 'synonymik' of Prodicus was 'seriously employed' by Thucydides (Eur. *Herakl.* i. p. 27); for the peculiarity of Prodicus' theory (*viid. Plat. Protag.*, particularly 337 A—C) is the hair-splitting tendency of all 'synonymik,' whereas Thucydides uses a variety of expressions with (apparently) no conscious distinction; nay, he goes so far as to stretch the meaning of an expression or word in order to use it as a synonym for variety's sake. Cf. e.g. vi. 54, 3 ὡς ἀπὸ τῆς ὑπαρχούσης ἀξιώσεως ('quantum pro sua auctoritate poterat' Classen), where ἀξιώσεως = δυνάμειος is employed because of τὴν ὑπάρχον δυνάμειν just before. Thucydides is a synonym-monger in quite a different sense from Prodicus. What Thucydides has, in common with Prodicus, Euripides and the other sophists, is rather an extreme self-consciousness in the use of language.—To return to the passage in hand, it may be further noted that the MSS. reading πάσχειν seems preferable to the emendation of Kirchhoff and Wilamowitz, πάσχει. Young men πολέμους αὐξάνουσι for various purposes: one, ὅπως στρατηλατῇ; another, ὡς ὑβρίξῃ δύνανται εἰς χεῖρας λαβών; another to make gain. Why add πάσχει τάδε? He experiences, is made the victim of—what? Were such an expression as πάσχει τάδε to appear on a page of Thucydides in such a context, editors of the Cobetan school would long ago have enclosed it '*uncis quadratis*.' It should at least be πράσσει τάδε. It is the πλήθος which suffers, βλάπτεται πάσχειν τάδε, i.e. the various ὕβρεις of the νέοι.—With this passage we may compare Thucydides vi. 12, 2, also vi. 15 (character of Alcibiades and the νεώτεροι). On our Euripidean passage Paley notes: 'There can be little doubt, from the tone of this passage, that Euripides had some particular party or person in view, whom he regarded as chiefly responsible for the continuance of the

disastrous war,—some Lamachus, Demosthenes or Cleon, whose ambitions he desired to rebuke.' The similarity of the passages in Thucydides just cited to the verses of Euripides is striking,—if nothing more. Cf. particularly τιμώμενοι χαίρουσι = ἄρχειν ἄσμενος αἰρεθείς (Thuc. vi. 12, 2. cf. τιμῶμαι ἐκ τοῦ τοιοῦτον *ibid.* 9, 2); οὐκ ἀποσκοπὼν τὸ πλήθος κτέ. = τὸ ἐαυτοῦ μόνον σκοπῶν (Thuc. vi. 12, 2); κέρδους οὐνεκα = διὰ δὲ πολυτέλειαν καὶ ὠφελῆθῃ τι ἐκ τῆς ἀρχῆς (Thuc. *loc. cit.*; the ἐκ τῆς ἀρχῆς is to be compared with ὅπως στρατηλατῇ in Eurip.); ὡς ὑβρίξῃ δύνανται εἰς χεῖρας λαβών = ὦν γὰρ ἐν ἀξιώματι ὑπὸ τῶν ἀστῶν ταῖς ἐπιθυμίαις μειζροσιν ἢ κατὰ τὴν ὑπάρχουσαν οὐσίαν ἐχρήτο ἐς τε τὰς ἱπποτροφίας καὶ τὰς ἄλλας δαπάνας (Thuc. vi. 15, 3). To endeavour to establish anything beyond an accidental resemblance between the Euripidean and Thucydidean passages would perhaps be unjustifiable. That there is however a striking similarity no one can deny.

Suppl. 253—256.

οὐ τοι δικαστὴν σ' εἰλόμην ἔργων ἐμῶν,
οὐδ' εἴ τι πράξας μὴ καλῶς εὐρίσκομαι
τούτων κολαστὴν κάπιτιμητὴν, ἀνάξ,
ἀλλ' ὡς ὀναίμην.

The variance of construction in this passage resembles that in the former and furnishes an excellent instance of final apposition. Moreover it proves that the writer himself was conscious of the final force. (Of course the 'final force' of any subordinate construction is not to be regarded as necessarily originally inherent in it.) Were we to attempt to bring the sentence before us into uniformity, we must either write ὡς βοηθόν (a word which Euripides does not, I think, employ), or, better, ὡς δικάζουσι—ὡς κολάζουσι κάπιτιμῶν, or even employ fut. participles with ὡς. It is not difficult to find other instances of final apposition, though I have no other example to cite in which the varying from final apposition to final clause shows the author so fully conscious of the finality in the appositional construction. Cf. e.g. Thuc. i. 53, 4 βοηθοὶ ἤλθομεν (= βοηθοῦντες or βοηθήσαντες ἤλθομεν: cf. *ib.* 63, 2 προήλθον ὡς βοηθήσαντες); *ib.* 94, 1 στρατηγὸς—ἐξεπέμφθη; *ib.* 95, 6 ἐκπέμπουσιν ἄρχοντα (cf. *ib.* 109, 2 πέμπει—ἄνδρα—, ὅπως—ἀπαγάγοι). In all these cases, as well as in our Euripidean passage, a final clause containing the cognate verb in the subjunctive might easily have been written. Indeed, it is the verbal force felt in such substantives

that renders them readily nominal equivalents of verbal expressions. One is surprised to observe that this mode of indicating finality finds no mention among the many varieties cited in the first section of Widmann's excellent and careful dissertation *De Finalium Enuntiatorum Usu Thucydideo* (Gött. 1875).

Suppl. 899 *sqq.*

πολλοὺς δ' ἐραστὰς κατὰ θηλειῶν ἴσας
ἔχων κτέ.

Canter emended ἴσας, which would naturally suggest itself to any one. Perhaps

the MSS. reading is a contamination arising from a variant ICAC
OMWC (i.e. ὁμῶς).

Suppl. 1232.

στείχωμεν, ἄδρασθ', ὄρκια δῶμεν.

Equivalent to στείχωμεν, ἴν' ὄρκια δῶμεν. An excellent survival of the paratactic construction out of which the final clause (in stricter sense) with subj. grew. This indicates the original hortatory character of this subj.

MORTIMER LAMSON EARLE.

THE TEXT OF THUCYDIDES VII.

III.

It is well known that from vi. 92, 5 onwards the *Vatican* and its Paris copy H (as far as it goes) contain a version of the text which varies very considerably from that given by all the other MSS. It is equally certain, after all that has been written on the subject, that it is useless to say that either version—the *Vatican* or the *Laurentian*—is the better. We must test each passage wherever there is a difference on its own merits.

Any one who observes the two versions closely soon notices that the *Vatican* constantly contains a little word—generally it is τε—which is wanting in other MSS. Probably the scribe used a better MS. from vi. 92, 5 onwards. Sometimes he may be emending the text on his own account. Some one has called him 'a great grammarian,' perhaps only half in earnest. But, in any case, the minute addition does, in nine cases out of ten, carry conviction with it. To give instances of what is perfectly well known to all who are concerned with the text of Thuc. would be merely tedious.

What I wish to suggest is that it is highly probable that there is a large number of omissions in the received text of Books i.—v. 92; for, if we had the second version of these books, we should certainly find small words often in that text where they do not appear in our MSS. Further, it appears that the addition of a small word where it seems to be required and where the omission can be properly accounted for, is a scientific method of emendation in Thuc. We can-

not always be certain; but at least we should not be ridiculed for trying this method.

That there are occasional lacunae in the text, all are agreed; but I suggest that omissions of small words are far commoner than is supposed.

I believe that some of the greatest difficulties which we encounter in the generally simple Seventh Book would disappear if we could recover here and there a word or two still wanting even in the *Vatican*. In c. 2, 4 for τῷ δὲ ἄλλῳ τοῦ κύκλου, I believe we should read τῷ δὲ ἄλλῳ <ἄνω> τοῦ κύκλου; and hope to be able to show in my notice of Professor Freeman's *Shorter History of Sicily* that not one of the suggested explanations of the vulgate is possible. In c. 7, 1 for μέχρι τοῦ ἐγκαρσίου τείχους, it would be better to read μέχρι <τοῦ Εἰρηνήλου> or <τοῦ τέλους> τοῦ ἐγκαρσίου τείχους than either to bracket μέχρι with some, or to explain the text as Freeman does. I shall have more to say on this passage also.

In c. 7, 4 for τρόπῳ ᾧ ἂν ἐν ὀλκάσιν ἡ πλοίοις ἢ ἄλλως ὅπως ἂν προχωρή, I feel fairly confident that we ought to read τρόπῳ ᾧ ἂν ἐνῇ, ὀλκάσιν ἡ πλοίοις ἢ ἄλλως ὅπως ἂν προχωρή. The dative without ἐν occurs in the same way a little further on; or even if it were impossible, we could fairly read <ἐνῇ>, ἐν.

In c. 56, 4 we at present read ἐθνη γὰρ πλείστα δὴ ἐπὶ μίαν πόλιν ταύτην ξυνηλθε, πλήν γε δὴ τοῦ ξυμπαντος ὄχλου τοῦ ἐν τῷδε τῷ πολέμῳ πρὸς τὴν Ἀθηναίων τε πόλιν καὶ Λακεδαιμονίων. But Stahl rightly objects

(1) that we cannot legitimately supply *ἐνελθεῖν* after *πολέμῳ*; for that in all other cases the infin. or partic. is only supplied to complete some verb that is expressed in the second clause, as in *οὐ μέντοι εὐθύς γε ἀπέστη ἀλλὰ διανοεῖτο*: and (2) that, even if we could, the sense given is absurd. So I suggest *ἐν τῷδε τῷ πολέμῳ <πολεμοῦντος> πρὸς τὴν...*, and all becomes satisfactory.

Lastly, in c. 75, 6 there has been much dispute over *καὶ μὴν ἡ ἄλλη αἰκία, καὶ ἡ ἰσομοιρία τῶν κακῶν, ἔχουσά τινα ὅμως τὸ μετὰ πολλῶν κούφισιν, οὐδ' ὥς ῥαδίᾳ ἐν τῷ παρόντι εἰδοξάζετο*. The remarks of Classen and Stahl have been severely handled by Junghahn in his *Studien zu Thuk.* It seems plain that *ἡ ἰσομοιρία τῶν κακῶν* is *part* of the *αἰκία*: was it not a terrible thing that highest and

lowest, that Nicias and the humblest camp-follower, should be in the same plight? Yet, as Machiavelli remarks, 'general evils are endured more easily than private ones.' Hence both *ἡ ἄλλη αἰκία* and the special *αἰκία* brought in them *κούφισιν τινα*, namely *τὸ μετὰ πολλῶν*.

But, in order that we may get this sense from the Greek, must we not follow the regular Thucydidean form of expression by reading *ἡ <τ'> ἄλλη αἰκία καὶ ἡ ἰσομοιρία τῶν κακῶν*, that the one part may be the complement of the other?

I have still to deal with a few passages in which either the punctuation is wrong or the letters have been confused.

E. C. MARCHANT.

PROPERTIUS III. (IV.) 22, 3.

Dindymus et sacra fabricata inventa Cybebe (or Cibeles).

This MS. line has been variously corrected, the change which has found most favour being Haupt's *e vite*, for the unmeaning *inventa*.

But a passage in Pausanias, viii. 46, makes it probable that the word which Propertius put before *Cybebe* was *dente*; for Pausanias there says that the face of the Mater Dindymene at Cyzicus (to which Propertius is referring) was made of 'wrought teeth of the hippopotamus.' *Κυζικηνοί τε ἀναγκάσαντες πολέμῳ Προκορινήσιους γενέσθαι σφίσι συνοίκους Μητρὸς Διὸς Διὸς ἀγάλμα ἔλαβον ἐκ Προκορινήσου· τὸ δὲ ἄγαλμα ἐστὶ χρυσοῦ, καὶ αὐτοῦ τὸ πρόσωπον ἀντὶ ἐλέφαντος ἵππων τῶν ποταμίων ἐδόντες εἰσὶν εἰργασμένοι.*

I pointed out this passage to Mr. Robinson Ellis, and proposed to read *fabricata e dente*; but he thinks that would not account for the corruption *inventa*, and that the true reading must be *in dente*. He happily cites 'casus effingere in auro' (the sense being 'in the material of gold'), Virg. *Aen.* vi. 32. So 'caelataque in auro,' *Aen.* i. 640.

What word should precede *fabricata*, is more doubtful. It might be *sacro*, if the point thereof could be discerned. Mr. Ellis cites a curious remark of Aelian's, *Hist. Anim.* vii. 19, on the hippopotamus, *ἀρεβέστατον δὲ καὶ ὁ ποτάμιος ἵππος, γένεται γὰρ καὶ τοῦ πατρὸς.*

He suggests that *sacro* might be meant to refer to this habit of the animal, as if his tusks were set apart for use in the goddess' image 'in some connexion with the ideas of piety to parents, which Lucretius associates with her cultus, ii. 614-617.' Otherwise *sacro* seems pointless. But I venture to think the lost word is *secto*, if it be not too wide of the MS. *sacro*. Virgil has 'secto elephanto,' *Aen.* iii. 464. The idea would be 'sections of teeth,' so that *secto* would roughly correspond to Pausanias' word *εἰργασμένοι*. The teeth, if used at all, must have been in sections, or they could not have fitted; so that, if *dente* be right, the idea of *secto* is naturally implied, whether it be expressed or not.

On the other hand, if Propertius wrote *secto*, it could hardly have kept its place when *dente* was once lost, having become thereby unmeaning.

Mr. Ellis says, 'I do not deny that *secto* would be far better in every way; nor is the change very violent. The passage too is obviously one which descended from an early period in a completely vitiated state; *secto* may therefore be considered very likely.'

If we accept these views, the line runs

Dindymus, et secto fabricata in dente Cybebe.

A. T. BARTON.

ON THE MODE OF SELECTING JURORS FOR THE LAW COURTS DESCRIBED
IN THE LAST PART OF THE PAPYRUS ON THE CONSTITUTION OF
ATHENS.

IN the second edition of my translation I gave no opinion on the uses of the various vessels and implements which are named in chapter 63 and subsequent columns of the papyrus as employed in the process of filling each law court with its complement of jurors. I imagined the data were insufficient to found any serious conjecture, and was led by a misconception of the functions of the letters, *A, B, C*, etc., to suppose the problem more intricate than it really is. But after a careful perusal of the remarks of Dr. Sandys in his edition of the text, the following view seems to me to harmonize with all the positive statements of the papyrus, and to supply a tolerably satisfactory scheme.

In chapter 63 we should adopt the suggestion of Dr. Sandys: *εἰσοδοὶ δὲ εἰσὶν εἰς τὰ κληρωτήρια* (instead of *δικαστήρια*) *δέκα, μία τῇ φυλῇ ἐκάστη*. There were ten balloting-rooms in a common building in some central position, each tribe having its room with a separate entrance. Although it is not stated in any of the extant columns, we must further suppose that each court (*δικαστήριον*) had ten entrances, not one for each tribe but, one for each juror division, *A, B, C*, etc., of whatever tribe. Each court also had its individual name Green, Red, Triangular (*βατραχιῶν, φοινικιῶν, τρίγωνον*), etc.

The text should then proceed: *καὶ κληρωτήριδες* (not *κληρωτήρια*) *εἴκοσι, δύο τῇ φυλῇ ἐκάστη*. In each balloting-room there were two balloting-urns (*κληρωτήριδες*), destined for the lottery by dice (*κυβεία*), one originally filled with a certain number of black and white cubes, the other receiving them as they were successively drawn by the archon. This last emendation is called for by two considerations: (1) no vessels for the cube-drawing are otherwise mentioned, and (2) a second balloting-room, as Dr. Sandys observes, would be superfluous. Similarly two vases (*ἰδρύαι*) served for the reception of the acorns (*βάλανοι*) whereby the jurors were allotted to the separate letters, *L, M, N*, etc., which in their turn were allotted to the separate courts. The employment of two *ἰδρύαι*, the second receiving the acorns as they were successively withdrawn from the first, is suggested by M. Haussoulier.

Every juror had a ticket, of which Dr. Sandys gives a representation, containing the name of the juror, his father, and his deme, and in the left-hand corner one of the first ten letters of the alphabet, *A, B, C*, etc. These letters did not distinguish the tribe of the juror, for the jurors of every tribe formed ten divisions, each distinguished by one of the letters. The divisions were permanent and simply or principally served, it would seem, to facilitate ingress and egress into and out of the law courts; each of which, as above suggested, must be supposed to have had ten entrances and exits, each distinguished by one of these letters. If ever the tribes consisted of precisely ten demes, each letter, *A, B, C*, etc., may have been the symbol within each of the tribes for one of its demes.

The whole process of sortition appears, so far as it is described in the legible columns of the papyrus, to have consisted of five operations, two of which served to the allotment of the courts to the causes which were to be tried (*κλήρωσις δικαστηρίων*) and three to the selection of the jurors and their distribution among the courts (*κλήρωσις δικαστῶν*).

Κλήρωσις δικαστηρίων.

1. Assignment of a letter, *L, M, N*, etc., to a court (*ἐπικλήρωσις τῶν γραμμάτων τοῖς δικαστηρίοις*, ch. 63). This process would be simple and the work of the united archons, as would also the next stage.

2. Assignment of a court to a magistrate (*ἐπικλήρωσις τῶν δικαστηρίων ταῖς ἀρχαῖς*, ch. 59).

Until this was done it would not be known what cases would be tried and how many jurors would be wanted in each court.

Κλήρωσις δικαστῶν.

3. Exhibition of the juror-tickets (*πινάκια*) on frames (*κανονίδες*).

In each balloting-room the tickets of the jurors had been cast into ten boxes (*κιβώτια*) marked like the tickets with the first ten letters of the alphabet. From each of these boxes a ticket was drawn by the archon to designate the Affixer (*ἐμπηκτής*), whose duty it was to affix the tickets as they were

successively drawn from the *κιβώτια* on one of the ten *κανονίδες* marked with the same letter as the ticket, where they would be visible to all who were interested. This operation, besides enabling the tickets to be easily counted, seems only to have determined the order in which they were to be withdrawn from the frames in the next operation.

4. Drawing lots for the service of the day.

Each ticket was taken in order from its frame, and simultaneously a white or black cube was drawn by the archon from the balloting-urn (*κληρωτήρις*). A white cube imported selection for service, a black cube rejection. The proportion of white cubes to black depended on two things, the number of jurors required from each tribe, and the total number of tickets on the frames. If there were 500 tickets on the frames, and only 300 jurors wanted from each tribe, there would be 300 white cubes and 200 black. In another room the number of black cubes would be different.

5. Assignment of jurors to a letter, *L*, *M*, *N*, etc.

This was decided by each juror, as soon as he was selected, drawing an acorn (*βάλανος*) inscribed with one of the letters *L*, *M*, *N*, etc., from a vase (*ὀδρία*) and showing it to the presiding archon; who thereupon cast the ticket of the juror into a box (*κιβώτιον*) inscribed with the same letter. The acorn drawn by the juror was then thrown aside into the second *ὀδρία*. The requisite number of acorns to be inscribed respectively with each of the letters could be computed by the archons as soon as the courts had been assigned to the magistrates, and not sooner. According as different magistrates had the hegemony of the courts, some would require 251 jurors, others 501, others 1001, others 1501. Those under the hegemony of the Forty required either 201 or 401, ch. 53. The total number of acorns marked with a given letter, *L*, *M*, *N*, etc., would be divided by ten, and one tenth of the number would have to be supplied by each balloting-room.

To illustrate the working of the method, suppose, taking round numbers, ten courts, *L*, *M*, *N*, etc., were to be filled, and a total of 5000 jurors, 500 from each tribe, to be selected. Let the bodies of jurors in each court be denominated sections, and the permanent bodies into which the jurors of each tribe were separated divisions. The sections might vary much in dimension, but let us consider a particular section consist-

ing of 500. These 500 would consist of ten contingents of 50, contributed by each of the tribes: and each contingent of 50 would consist of ten divisions of 5 each, viz. $5A + 5B + 5C$, etc. Or, if we take another line of cleavage, our hypothetical section would consist of ten divisions of 50 each, viz. $50A + 50B + 50C$, etc., each of these divisions being formed by contingents, $5A + 5A + 5A$, etc., from different tribes.

The white cubes, being limited in number, would prevent the selection of more jurors than were wanted. But supposing in one of the balloting-rooms one of the boxes, *A*, *B*, *C*, etc., and consequently one of the frames *A*, *B*, *C*, etc., was empty or contained less than its normal quota, say 15 or 10 or 5 or 0 instead of 20; or that all or many of these tickets encountered a black cube when drawn from the frame; the drawing of lots (*κυβεία*) would continue for the tickets on the other frames until all the cubes were exhausted; and, so far as the given tribe's contingent affected the issue, some of the divisions, *A*, *B*, *C*, etc., would be more strongly represented in the sections, *L*, *M*, *N*, etc., than others. But supposing the whole tribe was unable to furnish its quota, was the number made up from the other balloting-rooms, and, if so, by what rule? And what happened if the number required could not be furnished by the combined lists of all the ten tribes? Were the courts allowed to sit and try cases with less than the normal complement of jurors? These and other problems were probably solved in the columns of the papyrus now illegible.

The scheme proposed was pronounced above to be tolerably satisfactory. The only objection to it that occurs to me is that the combination of the two operations numbered 3 and 4 seems unnecessary. Either operation alone would have sufficed. If no more than the required number of tickets had been allowed to be affixed to the frames there would have been no need of the lottery with the cubes. Or again the *κυβεία* might have taken place without the antecedent insertion of the tickets on the frames. But perhaps a twofold action of chance was thought to be a greater safeguard against any fraudulent manipulation of the lottery than a single one would have been.

With the exception of the use of *κληρωτρίδες* the whole scheme here propounded is, I think, to be found suggested in the notes of Dr. Sandys. In one small detail I would differ from him. In the lines from the *Plutus* of Aristophanes

ἐν τῇ σορῷ ννὶ λαχὼν τὸ γράμμα σου δικά-
ζειν,
σὺ δ' οὐ βαδίξεις, ὃ δὲ Χάρων τὸ σύμβολον
δίδωσιν,

Dr. Sandys takes τὸ γράμμα as equivalent to τὸ πινάκιον. It surely rather stands for the letter, *L, M, N* etc., which a juror obtained by drawing an acorn (5) and which by a previous sortition (1) had been assigned to a certain court, τὸ βατραχιῶν, τὸ φονικιοῦν, etc.

The sentence *νεμένηται γὰρ κατὰ φυλάς* δέκα μέρη οἱ δικασταὶ παραπλησίως ἴσοι [ἴσα] ἐν ἐκάστῳ τῷ γράμματι, ch. 63, is more obscure and presents a more arguable question. I cannot myself by any permissible strain force it to yield the scheme above described if the words ἐν ἐκάστῳ τῷ γράμματι refer, as Dr. Sandys interprets, to the divisions *A, B, C*, etc. I rather suppose that they refer to the sections, *L, M, N* etc. Then κατὰ φυλάς is equivalent to ἐν ἐκάστῃ τῇ φυλῇ, and the ten μέρη are the ten divisions, *A, B, C*, etc.; or, to distinguish tribal divisions from state divisions, call them *a, b, c*, etc.

The sections *L, M, N*, etc. might be very unequal; and, consequently, a tribe's division, *a*, in one section, *L*, might be very unequal to the same tribe's division, *a*, in another section, *M*; but would generally (παραπλησίως) be equal to its other divisions, *b, c, d*, etc., within the same section *L* (ἐν ἐκάστῳ τῷ γράμματι).

The chance, however, that presided over the cube and acorn-drawing must often have produced an inequality in the number of jurors contributed by the different divisions, *a, b, c*, &c., of the same tribe to a single section: and this disparity would now and then exceed the limits of approximate equality (παραπλησίως ἴσα), unless that term is used with considerable latitude. These

tribal disparities would, however, compensate one another, and the state divisions, *A, B, C*, &c., would be represented in each section with approximately equal strength. This favours Reinach's suggestion, to omit κατὰ φυλάς as an interpolation. A somewhat similar expression, ch. 21, διένειμε δὲ καὶ τὴν χώραν κατὰ δήμους τριάκοντα μέρη, gives no assistance. There the words κατὰ δήμους present a difficulty which perhaps should be removed by reading καὶ τοὺς δήμους.

A similar use of the phrase κατὰ φυλάς may, however, be found in the beginning of ch. 63, τὰ δὲ δικαστήρια πληροῦσιν (better than κληροῦσιν) οἱ ἐννέα ἄρχοντες κατὰ φυλάς. These words chiefly refer to operation 5, and mean that the courts received their complement of jurors in fractions (tenth parts) furnished by the archons from the tribal balloting-rooms. In other words, the sections were composed of contingents from every tribe.

The later passage, *νεμένηται γὰρ κατὰ φυλάς δέκα μέρη οἱ δικασταὶ παραπλησίως ἴσα ἐν ἐκάστῳ τῷ γράμματι*, may be translated: 'The jurors are brigaded, by a formation which pervades the tribes, in ten divisions, which furnish, roughly speaking, equal contingents to every court.' This may be decomposed into two propositions: the divisions are composed of contingents from every tribe, and the sections are composed of contingents from every division. It seems, then, unnecessary to adopt Reinach's proposal to omit the words κατὰ φυλάς.

Dr. Sandys, ch. 63, note 1, interprets the words, τοὺς δὲ δικαστὰς κληροῦσι, ch. 59, as referring to the permanent enrolment in the divisions *A, B, C*, &c. I suppose they rather refer to the daily sortition for the sections, *L, M, N*, &c.

E. POSTE.

THE CHRONOLOGY OF THE ELEAN WAR.

A COMPLETE solution of all the difficulties involved in this problem, which has occupied the attention of commentators and historians for more than a century, is almost out of the question: we have to content ourselves with weighing one set of probabilities against the other.

The problem is twofold. (1) Did the Elean war last two years or three? (2)

Did the war take place before or after the XCV Olympiad (400 B.C.)? For Grote's common-sense remark (ix. 49) that, had the war been going on at the time of the Olympic festival, the fact would hardly have been left unnoticed by all the ancient authorities, effectually disposes of Clinton's chronology (i.e. 401–399 B.C.).

As to (1) E. Curtius (*Gr. Gesch.* Bk. v.

note 70) follows Diodorus and limits the war to two years, regarding Grote's view, which spreads it over three years, to be erroneous. Pausanias (iii. 8. 3—5), who is evidently following Xenophon, speaks of three years—*τῷ δὲ ἐφεξῆς ἔτει... τρίτῳ δὲ ἔτει τοῦ πολέμου*. Did he then misinterpret Xenophon, who being a contemporary authority is manifestly of the chiefest importance? If we examine the passage in the *Hellenica* (iii. 2, 21—30), there can hardly be a doubt that he did not. According to Xenophon, Agis' first campaign was cut short by the occurrence of an earthquake. But *περιόντι τῷ ἐνιαυτῷ* the ephors again declared war against the Eleans. Now the phrase *περιόντι τῷ ἐνιαυτῷ* can only mean, 'when the year was drawing to a close' (cf. Classen's note to Thuc. i. 31 *περιόντι τῷ θέρει*); and as Xenophon, like Thucydides, always begins his year about our April, the close of his year must be February or March. On this interpretation, what follows immediately becomes intelligible. The Spartans, we are told, summoned contingents from their allies, who all, even including the Athenians, obeyed the summons, except the Boeotians and Corinthians. Then Agis at the head of this army entered Elis through Aulon, whereupon the Lepreates and others revolted from the Eleans. The Spartan king sacrificed at Olympia without opposition, and next proceeded to plunder the country: so rich was the booty that many Achaeans and Arcadians volunteered to join him. As he approached the city itself, internal dissensions broke out; notwithstanding this, Agis after waiting a while inactive retired, leaving a garrison at Epitalium. All this must have occupied a considerable time, namely, all the spring and the best part of the summer of the second year's campaign, so that we are not surprised to learn (§ 30) that this garrison continued to ravage the country *τὸ λοιπὸν θέρος καὶ τὸν ἐπὶ οὐρα χειμῶνα*. At last *τοῦ ἐπὶ οὐρα θέρους* (i.e. in the third year) the Eleans, to avoid further suffering, consented to accept the terms imposed by Sparta. Evidently therefore Xenophon represents the events as extending over three years, and Diodorus is wrong in limiting them to two years.

The second question is much more difficult. Grote and Curtius both follow the chronology of Diodorus (xiv. 17 and 34), who places the beginning of the war in the archonship of Mico (July 402—July 401) and the end in the archonship of Xenaenetus (Exaenetus, (July 401—June 400). Cur-

tius, repeating Grote (ix. 49) with additions of his own, gives two reasons for his view: (a) that this date agrees best with the chronology of the life of Phaedo, the friend of Socrates, (β) that it is in almost exact harmony with the chronology of the two Spartan kings, Agis and Agesilaus.

The first argument, it will soon appear, is not a very strong one. *Φαίδων* 'Hlaetos, Diogenes Laertius informs us (ii. 9), *τῶν εὐπατριδῶν συνεάλω τῇ πατρίδι*. Curtius,¹ following Preller, maintains that Phaedo, who was, as we know from Plato, present at Socrates' death in the month of Thargelion (c. May) 399 B.C., must have been taken captive in a war with Elis a year or two before that date. But no other war with Elis, at all suitable in point of time, is known to history, except the one recorded in Xenophon and Diodorus; therefore the three years of the Elean war must have been 402—400. Could we trust Diogenes, this argument would of course be irrefragable. But not only is Diogenes a very poor authority in matters of history, but another version of the story appears in Suidas (*s.v.* *Φαίδων*), who states that Phaedo was captured *ὑπὸ Ἰνδῶν* and sold to Athens. The reading *Ἰνδῶν* is manifestly wrong, but no satisfactory conjecture has yet been proposed to replace it. On the whole therefore, if this statement of Diogenes stood alone, not very much weight could be given to it. Plato at any rate knows nothing about the slavery of Phaedo.

But, Curtius goes on to say, this same date harmonizes with the length of the reigns of Agis and Agesilaus. As far as Agis is concerned, however, this assertion appears on a close examination of the passages in the ancient authorities to rest on a very slender foundation. It is true that in xii. 35 Diodorus tells us that Agis reigned for 27 years, and that we know from Thucydides (iii. 89) that he came to the throne in the winter 427—426, so that he must according to these dates have died in 399 B.C. It is true too that Plutarch (*v. Ages.* 40) sets the reign of Agesilaus, his successor, at 41 years, which would make the date of the latter's death to be 358—a date which agrees very well with the date (viz. 359) given in Manetho's list for the accession of Ochus, king of Persia, against whom the aged king of Sparta had been serving in Egypt, when he met his death on his return march before he could reach Cyrene. Surely, however, even if the risk of basing history upon isolated numerals be left out

¹ Cf. Preller, *Rhein. Mus.* iv.

of account, such a combination is purely arbitrary; and if we put together Diodorus' own statements about these kings, we find ourselves involved in hopeless contradictions. For in xii. 35 he makes Agis ascend the throne in 434—433, and even if we regard the appearance of Agis' name in xv. 82, where it ought to be that of Agesilaus, as a mere slip of the pen, we hear of Agis in his narrative as late as the year 405—404 (cf. xiii. 104 and 107)—dates which give him a reign of at least 29 years, or if we are to suppose him to have lived till 399—for Diodorus nowhere speaks of his death or of the accession of Agesilaus—of 34 years. Curtius, however, asserts that Diodorus' 27 years is an excerpt from some good authority. But if Curtius admits, as he does, that the war came to an end in the spring of 400 B.C., then, since it is plain from Xen. *Hell.* iii. 3, 1 that Agis died immediately after the conclusion of the war, and we know from Thuc. that he came to the throne in 426, he can only have reigned 26 years. Again Diodorus xv. 93 puts Agesilaus' death under the year 362—361—a date which gives him at most only a reign of 38 years, supposing that he came to the throne in 399. In short Curtius' whole scheme rests upon a series of more or less arbitrary conjectures.

The alternative system is that proposed by Sievers, and followed by Breitenbach and A. Holm. It depends on the statement of Xenophon (*Hell.* iii. 2, 21)—who, it must always be remembered, was himself contemporary with the events—that *τούτων ... πρῶτον ἐν τῇ Ἀσίᾳ ὑπὸ Δερκυλίδᾳ* at the same time the Elean war took place in Greece. Now, by reckoning back from Xenophon's *Anab.* vii. 6. 1, and from the eclipse of Aug. 14, 394,¹ it appears that Dercylidas took the command in Asia in

¹ *Hell.* iv. 3, 13.

the autumn of 399 and that Agesilaus succeeded him in the spring or summer of 396. At the time of Cinadon's conspiracy, which is related by Xen. immediately before the king's expedition to Asia,² Agesilaus had not yet been a year upon the throne. Supposing then that his predecessor Agis died in the spring of 397, the conspiracy may very well have taken place in the winter months of 397—396, and would give an additional reason³ for the ephors being willing to send Agesilaus abroad at the head of 2000 Neodamodes or enfranchised Helots. If then Agis died in the spring of 397, his first expedition against Elis must have taken place in 399, the year after the Olympic festival, and 398 must have been the year of his second and principal invasion. Thus this system of chronology is simple, self-consistent and dependent upon contemporary evidence. The only arguments against it are the date in Diodorus, who just about this period⁴ is perhaps more than usually inaccurate, and Diogenes Laertius' story about Phaedo, the origin of which cannot be traced, and which, first appearing as it does in the notoriously inaccurate pages of this writer of the second century of our era, cannot weigh against the statement of the contemporary author Xenophon. The arguments drawn from the length of the reigns of Agis and Agesilaus are, as it has above been shown, in themselves worthless. On the whole therefore it seems that the more probable date for the Elean war is 399—397 B.C.

G. E. UNDERHILL.

² *Hell.* iii. 3, 4.

³ Cf. Brasidas' expedition to Thrace, Thuc. iv. 80.

⁴ Thus Diodorus makes the rule of the Thirty at Athens extend from 404 to 401 instead of 8 months only, which was the real time. Again he puts the outbreak of the Elean war before the downfall of the Thirty. Finally he speaks of Pausanias and not Agis as commander of the army invading Elis.

THE REPEAL OF THE LEX AELIA FUFIA.

CICERO tells us in many passages that Clodius repealed the Lex Aelia Fufia, but speaks of this repeal in language so vague, and in some cases of such obvious exaggeration, especially in the speeches *pro Sestio* (15, 33) and *in Vatinius* (7, 18), as to raise the question whether we have not here a rhetorical over-statement rather than a record of historical fact. Clearly the first

question that one would wish to determine in an investigation of this law of Clodius is what were the provisions of the Lex Aelia and Lex Fufia, which were two distinct laws, as appears from many passages of Cicero (*in Pis.* 9; *de prov. cons.* 19, 46; *in Vat.* 7, 18). It is hopeless, however, to try to reconstruct in detail the sections of these laws that dealt with the auspices, the

only certain point in the conclusion about them being that certain clauses of the laws regulated the 'obnuntiatio' (Ascon. in *Pison.* p. 9, 'obnuntiatio, qua perniciosius legibus resistebatur, quam Aelia confirmaverat'). It was apparently a recognition by statute-law of the already existing rules of 'obnuntiatio,' and it cannot be shown that these laws in any way limited or extended a pre-existing usage. It is probable that the clauses of these laws which dealt with the auspices regulated the 'obnuntiatio' both of patrician and of plebeian magistrates, and probably also of officials, and even of private persons who were not magistrates at all.

The conclusion which an attempt will be made to establish is this: that if 'obnuntiatio,' as understood in the Lex Aelia Fufia, refers only to the 'spectio' belonging to the patrician magistrates, and to the 'auspicia impetrativa,' Cicero is right. Clodius did, in this case, repeal the Lex Aelia and Lex Fufia, so far as those laws dealt with the auspices. But if 'obnuntiatio' refers also to 'auspicia oblativa,' then Cicero must be wrong. This part of the laws was never repealed by Clodius.

The really important point in this question is to determine what is meant by 'obnuntiatio.' Mommsen seems to narrow the term too much when he holds that it could only be used of the announcement of auspices by a magistrate, not of the announcement of auspices by an augur (*nuntiatio*). 'Obnuntiatio' could be used undoubtedly of both. The definition of the word in Donatus (*ad Terent. ad. 4, 2, 9* 'qui malam rem nuntiat, obnuntiat, qui bonam adnuntiat: nam proprie obnuntiare dicuntur augures, qui aliquid mali ominis scaevumque viderint') is borne out by usage; Cicero in the *Philippics* (ii. 33, 83) says 'consul consuli, augur auguri obnuntiasti' and when using technical language speaks of 'dirarum obnuntiatio' (*de div. i. 16, 29*), the dirae being the 'auspicia oblativa,' that might be observed by the augurs as well as by the magistrates. Again there is a tendency to make the principle of the use of the auspices by the magistrate too symmetrical. It is tempting to believe, as Dio explains the system (38, 13), that the lightning, which the magistrate welcomed as for him a favourable 'impetrativum,' was for the holding of the comitia an unfavourable 'oblativum,' and that thus the magistrate could exercise his free and justifiable right 'de caelo servare.' But it does not explain everything, for it does not explain the 'obnuntiatio' of the tribune, who has not the right of 'spectio'

and therefore not the right of taking 'auspicia impetrativa.' This is of course recognized by Mommsen: but yet he does seem to assimilate the tribune to the other magistrates, and to regard the tribune's looking for the lightning as an anomaly. His statement of the difficulty is as follows (*Staatsrecht* ii. p. 284 [275]) 'Insofern die Obnuntiation sich auf Oblativauspicien bezieht, folgt ihre Statthaftigkeit auch gegen die Plebejerversammlung daraus, dass die Tribune späterhin als Magistrate der Gemeinde betrachtet wurden; darin aber liegt allerdings eine Anomalie, dass späterhin die Tribune sogar zu diesem Zweck die Blitzbeobachtung angestellt haben, die auf der Spectio ruht und zu den Impetrativauspicien gehört.' It certainly seems at first sight necessary that a magistrate who threatens 'obnuntiare' must claim for himself the right of 'spectio'; but it is probable that, when the tribune threatened 'de caelo servare' he did not do so in the same sense which the magistrates with imperium did. He merely asserts the likelihood of his seeing something (*oblativum*). It resembles the procedure of the consul, who has not the power to forbid his colleague to consult the senate, but yet asserts 'se non passurum quicquam agi,' i.e. that he will veto him if he does: and we must remember that this procedure belongs to the end of the Republic, to the period of open abuse of the auspices. There is really no more absurdity involved in a plebeian magistrate's threatening his likelihood of seeing something than in a patrician magistrate's suspending the comitia while he looks for a sign from heaven which may never come. The tribune's warnings, therefore, need have no connection with the 'spectio'; and the main point which must be insisted on is this—that 'obnuntiatio' may be used consciously of 'auspicia oblativa' alone: that the tribune, who never claims the right of 'spectio,' to whom the auspices are always 'oblativa,' is precisely on the same footing as the augur, who waits by the comitia or the concilium, to hear the thunder or see the lightning, and if the sign comes, to bid the magistrate adjourn the assembly: with the exception that the tribune, apparently to avoid being present at the 'comitia populi,' usually, though not invariably, sends the message instead of bringing it in person (App. *B.C.* iii. 7). The tribune, in fact, must not be assimilated to the 'magistratus populi' at all. The very sharpest line must have been drawn between the lowest of the patrician magistrates on

the one hand, and three classes of individuals on the other: these being, firstly the plebeian magistrates, secondly the augurs, and thirdly any private individual who happened to have seen an omen. The respect paid to a man's announcements depended, as Mommsen says, on the position he held in the state. It was only thus that the tribune's 'obnuntiatio' became important, because his position guaranteed his power of judgment. Enough has been said to show the impossibility of confining 'obnuntiatio' to the magistracy. If the Lex Aelia and the Lex Fufia enjoined respect to 'obnuntiatio' in the general sense, then Clodius' bill of 58 B.C. repealed only a portion of these sections. It was not an abrogation but only a 'derogatio' of this part of the law. For Clodius' law only abolished the 'spectio' of the patrician magistrates; the correct account is in fact that given by Asconius (*in Pison.* p. 9) 'ne quis per eos dies, quibus cum populo agi liceret, *de caelo servaret*,' the last words being taken in the strict sense of the 'spectio' (cf. Dio 38, 13, where παραρηπείν has the same force). His repeal did not touch the 'obnuntiatio,' based on 'auspicia oblativa,' belonging to the plebeian magistrates, to the augurs or to private individuals.

The proof that Clodius' law was limited to this object (a proof which far outweighs any of the vague statements of Cicero) is found in the actual instances of 'obnuntiatio' after the passing of the Clodian plebiscitum. It is also worth notice that a portion of the Lex Aelia Fufia remained unrepealed even after 58 B.C.; of this we have direct evidence (Cic. *ad Att.* iv. 16, 15): but it cannot be adduced as proof of the above contention, since these laws certainly contained other clauses than those relating to 'obnuntiatio.' They regulated the precedence of the comitia for elections and for laws (Cic. *ad Att.* i. 16, 13) and these regulations might not have been touched by Clodius. The proof, therefore, must rest mainly on the instances; and of these we may take the most doubtful instances first. The passage in the *pro Sestio* (78) in which Cicero says 'Nam si obnuntiasset Fabricio is, qui servasset de caelo [*al.* praetor, qui se servasse de caelo dixerat], accepisset respublica plagam, sed eam quam acceptam gemere posset,' which has excited so much comment, if the word 'praetor' is retained, in connection with the question whether the patrician magistrate had the right of 'obnuntiatio' against the tribune, does not concern us here, as the case is purely imaginary; and concerns us

the less, if we omit the word 'praetor' and believe that 'de caelo servare' had by this time come to be used in two senses: one being the strict 'spectio' of the patrician magistrate, the other the mere attention of the augur or tribune. Equally little can be made out of the passage of the *Philippics* (i. 25) where we find the words 'paratos habemus qui intercedant, paratos, qui rempublicam religione defendant.' Here too the statement is quite general. Where they become more particular, there we find that it is the tribunician 'obnuntiatio' which is dwelt on, as in *Phil.* ii. 99, where, in reference to Antonius' attempt to hold the 'comitia censoria' Cicero asks 'Cur autem ea comitia non habuisti? an quia tribunus plebis sinistrum fulmen nuntiabat?' with which may be compared the question asked by Cicero, in a letter to Atticus of the year 56 or 55 B.C., 'sane velim scire, num census impediunt tribuni diebus vitiandis (*ad Att.* iv. 9, 1). And in fact all the actual instances of 'obnuntiatio' after this period are those of the tribune or the augur. Such is that mentioned in the *pro Sestio* (79 and 83) and that in Appian (*B.C.* iii. 7) of the tribune Asprenas' fruitless attempt at 'obnuntiatio.' The somewhat grotesque instances in *ad Att.* iv. 3, 3 and 4, in the year 57 B.C. are also instances of tribunician interposition. The former passage has a peculiar interest for us. It runs 'proscripsit Sestius se per omnes dies comitiales *de caelo servaturum*,' which shows that this latter expression had ceased to be technical and could be used of the 'auspicia oblativa' of the tribune. The instances of religious interposition in the year 54 B.C. were certainly tribunician (Cic. *ad Q. fr.* iii. 3, 2; *ad Att.* iv. 16, 7). It is generally admitted that Antonius was acting strictly legally when, at the election of Dolabella, he pronounced the 'obnuntiatio' not as consul but as augur; and the difficulty of the augur's position in this case, as contrasted with the impregnable position of the patrician magistrate before the law of Clodius, is well brought out by Cicero's criticism (*Phil.* ii. 83), 'confecto negotio bonus augur (C. Laelius) diceret' 'alio die' inquit. Quid videras? quid senseras? quid audieras? Nec enim te de caelo servasse dixisti, neque hodie dicis.' A detailed examination of Cicero's further criticisms of Antonius' action (*Phil.* ii. 87) would occupy too much space. Two brief passages that are instructive may however be quoted. He says, 'nos enim (*i.e.* the augurs) nuntiationem solam habemus, consules *et reliqui magistratus* etiam spectationem': and again

he asks, 'How can any one tell that there will be a vitium 'nisi qui de caelo servare constituit? quod neque licet comitiis per leges (i.e. the Clodian). Cicero is here availing himself of the ambiguity of the words *de caelo servare*, noticed above. Antonius was admittedly keeping the Clodian law by making the 'obnuntiatio' as augur, not as consul: i.e. he refused to avail himself of his right of 'spectio.' He might, however, have 'observed the heavens' for an 'augurium oblativum' as augur: and it would have made no difference to the legality of his act whether he did or not. This Cicero wilfully confounds with the 'spectio.'

It surely cannot be a mere accident that all the instances of 'obnuntiatio' after Clodius' law, which was never repealed, are those of the tribunate and the augurate. It shows that the Clodian plebiscitum abolished the 'spectio' of the patrician

magistrates, so grossly abused by Bibulus the year before—an abuse which made it a question calling for immediate legislation. If we accept Dio's account of the motive of this measure, that is, that Clodius was afraid of his own legislation being impeded—a theory to some extent borne out by the language of Cicero (*de prov. cons.* 45)—this would have been another reason why Clodius would not shackle the tribunes' 'obnuntiatio': because we know that he was convinced that he could carry the whole college of tribunes with him for the year 58 B.C. (*Cic. ad Att.* iii. 23, 3). We may conclude, therefore, that the Clodian law abolished the 'spectio' as connected with 'auspicia imperativa' but that it did not touch the auspices as possessed by the tribunate or the augurate.

A. H. GREENIDGE.

JOWETT'S DIALOGUES OF PLATO.

The Dialogues of Plato, translated into English with Analyses and Introductions by B. JOWETT, M.A., Master of Balliol College, Regius Professor of Greek in the University of Oxford, Doctor of Theology of the University of Leyden. In five volumes. Third edition, revised and corrected throughout, with marginal Analyses and an Index of Subjects and Proper Names. Oxford. At the Clarendon Press, 1892. (New York, Macmillan & Co.) £4 4s.

We may accept these five substantial volumes from the Master of Balliol as a pleasant intimation that no further bulletins about his health are to be expected. A scholar who can publish a third edition of a monumental work like this may well feel that he has accomplished the work of an ordinary lifetime, but he is in no immediate danger of being relegated to the retirement of an *emeritus*. For twenty-one years Jowett's 'Plato' has been the Plato best known to English readers, and during this period it has probably done more than even the Greek text itself to make the 'father of Idealism' known in England and the United States. Let no one suppose that the second and third editions have been mere repetitions of the first with a few unimportant changes. The second was

distinctly in advance of the first, while the third is in many respects a new work. A slight inspection will show that the statement in the introductory note, that the additions and alterations 'affect at least a third of the work,' is a very modest and moderate one. The introductory essays have been enlarged, the analyses have been thoroughly revised, each page of the text and of the introduction has a heading to show its contents, and a copious marginal analysis with the speakers' names accompanies the whole text. It is seldom that a new edition makes such an advance on its predecessors.

Ten interesting pages of the new preface state the principles on which the present translation has been made. The chief of these is, that the translator must seek 'to produce on his readers an impression similar or nearly similar to that produced by the original. To him the feeling should be more important than the exact word.' In some cases he 'will re-write the passage as his author would have written it at first if he had not been "nodding"; and he will not hesitate to supply anything which, owing to the genius of the language or some accident of composition, is omitted in the Greek, but is necessary to make the English clear and consecutive.' The manner in which these principles have been applied in translating

Thucydides and Aristotle as well as Plato is already familiar to scholars, and the success which Dr. Jowett has attained is shown by the charm which his translations have for English readers. It is obvious that there are two classes for whom these versions are not made. 1. Exact scholars, who want to know the precise shade of meaning which the translator gives to each Greek word, or the construction which he adopts in interpreting a disputed passage or a doubtful text, will seek here in vain. This is often a source of disappointment to scholars, especially when the translator is understood to speak with authority about an author to whom he has devoted no small part of a laborious life; but this is not the place to look for learning of this kind. 2. These translations will be useless to the other extreme of the world of scholars, those who want a 'crib' or 'pony' to help them to learn their Greek lessons without the aid of dictionary and grammar. To them even the despised Bohn will give more solid comfort than the Master of Balliol, who has no idea of working for the like of these.

Jowett's 'Plato' is intended primarily and avowedly for the 'general reader,' to whom 'the feeling' is 'more important than the exact word,' who wants to know what Plato wrote and how he wrote it as completely as he can without a knowledge of Plato's language. The *Republic*, for example, is a work of art. The 'general reader' wants to have set before him a work of art which will produce the same impression on his mind which the *Republic* itself produced on the mind of a cultivated Greek in the fourth century B.C. This is a large demand. Those who make it seldom appreciate their disadvantage in not knowing Plato's language; but they are on this account the more easily satisfied with the substitute, the imperfections of which they never see or suspect. At one period Pope's 'Iliad,' made almost as many English-speaking youths enthusiastic for Homer as the *Iliad* itself. The most dangerous part of the translator's duty, as Dr. Jowett conceives it, comes when he feels called on to re-write a passage and to supply defects caused by the author's 'nodding,' remembering that the 'precise order and arrangement of the words may be left to fade out of sight when the translation begins to take shape.' Wherever the text is certain and its interpretation undisputed, a master of English style like Dr. Jowett, with his close acquaintance with Plato's language, cannot fail to make a version fulfilling all the conditions of a true transla-

tion which he so clearly states. This gives the present translation the 'freedom, grace, simplicity, and stateliness' for which it is well known. It is also obvious that, wherever the interpretation of a passage is doubtful, the liberties which this style of translation allows tend to emphasize unduly the translator's own view of the passage and sometimes to diffuse through the whole sentence an error or a doubt which perhaps concerns the meaning of only a single word. The text of Plato is fortunately well preserved, but passages of doubtful interpretation are found in all the more difficult dialogues. An illustration of what has been said may be seen in Dr. Jowett's version of the words in *Repub.* 511 A, εἰκόσι δὲ χρομένην αὐτοῖς τοῖς ὑπὸ τῶν κάτω ἀπεικαομένοις, — καὶ ἐκείνοις πρὸς ἐκείνα ὡς ἐναργεῖς δεδοξασμένοις τε καὶ τετιμμημένοις, which he thus translates: *but employing the objects of which the shadows below are resemblances in their turn as images, they having in relation to the shadows and reflections of them a greater distinctness and therefore a higher value.* Dr. Jowett differs from most interpreters in his understanding of ἀπεικαομένοις, and his peculiar view of this word colours his translation of the whole passage. The word is generally thought to mean the *likenesses* (cf. ὁμοιωθέν, 510 A) of the ideal triangles, squares, spheres, etc., which the mathematician finds in the world of sense and uses to represent to the eye the ideal forms. Thus the passage would mean: *but employing as images (of ideal triangles etc.), those very likenesses of them which the world below (the world of sense) presents—these likenesses, moreover, compared with the original ideas, being in human opinion reputed to be distinct and being honoured accordingly.*

Dr. Jowett still holds to his original opinion, with which we most cordially agree, that the youth of Athens were not corrupted by Sophists. He says (iv. p. 290): 'There is no ground for disbelieving that the principal Sophists, Gorgias, Protagoras, Prodicus, Hippias, were good and honourable men. The notion that they were corrupters of the Athenian youth has no real foundation, and partly arises out of the term "Sophist" in modern times.' Still, he cannot quite agree with Grote in thinking that 'an Athenian in the fifth century B.C. would have included Socrates and Plato, as well as Gorgias and Protagoras, under the specific class of Sophists.' And, although Aeschines, only a few years after Plato's death, called Socrates a Sophist, we cannot help feeling

that Socrates, Plato, and Aristotle do belong, in the history of human thought, to a distinct class from Gorgias, Protagoras and Hippias. But what is the fundamental distinction? Is it one which we should recognize as valid, or only one which would appeal to the prejudices of ancient Athens? If, for example, Protagoras could have taught Plato's doctrine of Ideas, and if Gorgias could have taught Aristotle's Rhetoric, would they have been any the less stigmatized as Sophists? The obvious answer, that they were smaller men than Plato and Aristotle and so took a narrower view of philosophy, does not cover the case. The very name Sophist implied a stigma, and Plato merely adopts the prevailing notion when he uses the term. The Sophist's fee, with all that it implied in ancient Athens, is the real ground of distinction. The use of philosophy as a means to a further end at once took it out of the exalted class of *ἐλεύθερα μαθήματα*, sciences which are their own masters and slaves to nothing. The example of Socrates, Plato, and Aristotle, who scorned to make profit of philosophy, intensified the common belief of the age that working for one's livelihood was degrading; and the epithet 'hireling,' with which the Sophists were constantly taunted, shows the deep-seated prejudice of a people who left hard labour to slaves and who invented the term 'liberal education' for an education fit for free men, to which only men of leisure could aspire. Zeller, in his *History of Greek Philosophy* (ii. p. 432, English translation), thus defines a Sophist perfectly: 'Every paid teacher of the arts included under higher culture is called a

Sophist.' He adds concerning the name: 'In itself it implies no judgment concerning the worth or scientific character of this instruction; it rather admits the possibility that the Sophistic teacher may impart genuine science and morality as well as the reverse.' When Zeller says elsewhere (note on ii. p. 502) that 'a Sophist is one who comes forward with the claim to be a teacher of wisdom, whereas he is not concerned with the scientific investigation of the subject, but only with the formal and practical culture of the subject,' he merely echoes the prejudices of ancient Athens against 'every paid teacher of the arts.' There is no evidence that Protagoras took any less 'scientific' interest in *πάντων μέτρον ἀνθρώπου* than Socrates did in the identity of all virtues with knowledge. Further, we must remember that all the great Sophists were dead before Plato began to teach and before Aristotle was born. The later race, whom they so thoroughly despised, have amply justified this contempt by disappearing and leaving no trace of themselves on the history of thought. As to the older Sophists, Plato had ample opportunity, in his dialogues devoted to the interviews of Socrates with Protagoras and Gorgias, to expose the corrupting doctrines of these two representative men if there were any. On the contrary, he never puts into the mouth of either of them any sentiment which could possibly be called corrupting or immoral. This is perhaps the most complete justification of the opinion respecting these eminent teachers which we have quoted above from Dr. Jowett.

Oct. 1892.

W. W. GOODWIN.

KEENE'S *ELECTRA* OF EURIPIDES.

The Electra of Euripides, with Notes and Appendix by CHARLES HAINES KEENE, M.A. Dublin. London: Geo. Bell & Sons, Covent Garden. Cambridge: Deighton, Bell and Co. 1893. 10s. 6d.

AN edition of this play was much needed, and Mr. Keene has not only supplied a *desideratum* in his scholarly and elegant edition, but has produced a work which will be valuable to teachers and students. I own that his introduction, though written with great ability and in excellent style, has not removed the prejudice which I have

always felt (in common with most admirers of Euripides) against this drama. I cannot help feeling that *Electra* is vulgarized. At the same time I heartily recognize the skill with which Mr. Keene has turned many of the angry lunges of the German assailant of Euripides, and I thank him for giving us the just remark of the great German poet: 'If a modern like Schlegel must pick out faults in so great an ancient, he ought only to do it upon his knees.'¹ Mr. Keene makes as good a defence as could be made of the play as a work of art; but one cannot help

¹ Eckermann's *Conversations of Goethe*.

fancying that one hears the Electra of Aeschylus and Sophocles appealing to the editor in the words of the modern poet, and asking

'Is it well to wish thee happy? having known me, to decline
On a range of lower feelings and a narrower heart than mine?'

We, however, do wish the editor happy, and the edition all the success which it deserves; and we anticipate that the very discussion which has raged about the literary merits of the play will invest it with a peculiar interest and largely increase the number of its readers.

Mr. Keene has made a considerable number of suggestions as to readings which might be adopted in the text, but has not introduced them into the text of his edition. They are all interesting and scholarly, and usually involve but a very slight change of the MS. reading. His *ἠλλελοῖπας* for *ἠλλελοῖπας*, published already in the *Classical Review*, seems to be a certain emendation. Of the rest perhaps the best is *γενέσθαι* for *γενέσθαι* in 785, where Mr. Keene should have pointed out, for the sake of beginners, that Schenkl's *γενέσθαι* is unmetrical, not an uncommon fault in German conjectures. I also like his suggestion of *δυνών* for *δυνού* in 985; and to his able defence of it I would add the consideration that copyists are prone to assimilate adjectives to the nearest substantive. In 990 his *ζαθέων* seems the best of the proposed corrections of *ἀγαθῶν*, and his conjectures on 1058 and 1060 are ingeniously defended.

The note on 30 contains a shrewd remark on a fragment of Sophocles, but I must protest against the theory in note on 96 that *βάλλω* means 'to go,' and that that meaning is established by Dr. Verrall on Aesch. *Ag.* 1172. Perhaps for *ἐκβάλλω* we should read *ἐκμόλω*. Neither can I agree with Mr. Keene that *ἐνοπῆς παλαιῶν πατρὸς σφαγισμῶν* could mean 'her father's blood that cries from the ground for vengeance'; nor do I think such a translation would seem possible but for 'the voice of thy brother's blood crieth unto me from the ground' in Genesis. Mr. Keene might have noticed that *μῶρον* in 50 has a meaning exactly opposite to that of 'lewd, sensual,' which it often bears, and seems to denote a certain *ἀγροικία* or *ἀνασθησία* involved in the continence of the peasant husband of Electra. Nor would it have been superfluous to notice the rare use of *ἡλίου* for

'days' in 654 (it is however subsequently noticed and illustrated in the note on a similar use of *σελήνη* in 1126); nor to point out that his, undoubtedly right, explanation of 662 is borne out by 1046; nor to warn beginners that *κελάδει* in 716 is the imperfect, and that *εἴσοφιν* in 1085 is 'an object-lesson.'

I add a few comments and suggestions which have occurred to me on a reperusal of the play:—

394, 395. ὥς ἐμοὶ πίνης
εἶν πρόθυμος πλουσίου μάλλον ξένος.

Does not this justify the ordinary view of the meaning of *σιωπηλὸς σοφός* in *Med.* 320, as against Dr. Verrall's more subtle explanation?

In 475, the fourth syllable (corresponding strophically to the first syllable of *ἀγροτήρι*) may be long as well as short. Accordingly I would read

Πειρηναῖον φθεροῦσα πῶλον.

In 606, 607 I propose with some confidence

εὔρημα γὰρ τοι ῥῆμα γίγνεται τόδε,
'κοιῇ μετασχεῖν τὰγαθοῦ καὶ τοῦ κακοῦ.'

The verse in inverted commas is *ῥῆμα* 'a saw,' and could hardly be called *χρήμα*. See Pindar *Isthm.* ii. l. 10 where '*χρήματα χρήματ' ἀνὴρ*' is called *ῥῆμ' ἀλαθείας ἐπὶς ἀγχιστα βαῖνον*.

615. Perhaps

τείχεων μὲν ἔλθων ἐντὸς οὐκ ἂν εὐθenoῖς.

616. φρουραῖς κέκασται δεξιαῖς τε δορυφόρον.

For *δεξιαῖς* I would suggest *διαδοχαῖς*, a military term used also in *Iph. T.* 79.

685. καὶ σοὶ προφώνῳ πρὸς τὰδ' Ἀγισθὺν θανεῖν (or *θενεῖν*).

Whatever Electra says in this verse, she assigns in the succeeding ones, as her reason for saying it, her resolution to destroy herself if her brother should be slain in his attempt. She may therefore have said

καὶ σοὶ προφώνῳ πρὸς τὰδ' αἰσχιστον (or *ἀλγιστον*) θανεῖν.

'that your death will be most disgraceful (or most bitter) to you, as involving that of your sister.' What she would most naturally have said would have been

καὶ σοὶ προφώνῳ ταῦτα πρὸς τῶν φιλάτων (or *πρὸς τῶν ἐγγύθεν*),

'in the name of your nearest and dearest kin.'

In 719 I would accept Seidler's conjecture, ὡς ἐστὶ λόγος Θυέστων, reading in the antistrophic verse 705 καλλιπλόκαμον with the MSS.; for πλόκαμος does not necessarily refer to human hair; see Eur. *Bacchae* 112. Nauck's εἶτα δόλοι Θυέστων is un-Greek and frigid.

865. For ἀμπυχαί perhaps read ἀνστροφαί.

941—944. This passage seems spurious. The sentiment is a mere repetition of the foregoing verses; and the use of αἶρει can hardly be really paralleled in classical Greek, though there are passages which seem to defend it at first sight. It seems to bear here the post-classical sense of *tollit* 'takes away,' as in the precept of Marcus Aurelius, ἄρον τὸ βέβλαμεναι, ἥρται ἢ βλάβη.

In 1191 I would take ὥσπας ἀφαντα together, rendering 'Thou didst vouchsafe that a cursed marriage should be utterly abolished out of the land.'

The passage in the play which seems most worthy of Euripides is 294, 295—

ἐνέστι δ' οἶκτος ἀμαθία μὲν οὐδαμοῦ
σοφοῖσι δ' ἀνδρῶν καὶ γὰρ οὐδ' ἀζήμιον
γνώμην ἐνέειναι τοῖς σοφοῖς λίαν σοφίῃ.

This recognition of the penalties entailed by superior culture is very Euripidean, and recalls a less temperate judgment in Browning's *Paracelsus*—

'Mind is nothing but disease,
And natural health is ignorance.'

There is fine irony in Electra's invitation to Clytaemnestra to enter her poor abode, 1139, when she bids her be careful lest she soil her robes in the smoky cabin—

χώρει πένητας εἰς δόμους· φρούρει δέ μοι
μή σ' αἰθαλώσῃ πολύκαπνον στέγος πέπλους.

The reflections, too, of Orestes on his mother's murder are in the good vein of Eur.: 1206:

κατεῖδες οἶον ἂ τάλαιν' ἐμῶν πέπλων
ἐλάβες, ἔδειξε μαστὸν ἐν φοναῖσιν,
ὦ ὦ μοι, πρὸς πέδω
τιθεῖσα γόνата μέλεια; τακόμαν δ' ἐγώ.

For the rest, I fear we must still admit that the play really contains nothing worth reading, except some choral odes which, though finely executed lyrics, are absolutely irrelevant to the plot of the drama.

R. Y. TYRRELL.

ZIEGLER'S CLEOMEDES.

ΚΛΕΟΜΗΔΟΥΣ ΚΥΚΑΙΚΗΣ ΘΕΩΡΙΑΣ
ΜΕΤΕΠΩΝ ΒΙΒΛΙΑ ΔΥΟ ad novorum
codicum fidem edidit H. ZIEGLER. Teubner, 1891. Mk. 2.70.

THE editor tells us that he has made use of three MSS. in framing his text. The most important, in his opinion, is a Florence MS. of the 12th century (Laurent. lxix. 13) which was previously uncollated. The second, a Leipzig MS., belongs to the same family, but is in worse condition. The third, a Nuremberg MS. of the 14th century, belongs to a later family and has many interpolations. *Omnes alios codices*, he says, *consulto negleximus*. Whether this neglect is justified or not, does not appear from the Preface. He has also admitted into his text emendations by Manitius and others, given an improved Latin translation, and added an excellent Index both of names and words.

I cannot say that the new text strikes me

as altogether an improvement on that of Bake (1820). The emendations by Manitius are, I think, often needless, to say the least. Thus in I. 1, p. 12, l. 26 (after ὁ αἰθήρ καταλήγει εἰς τὸν αἶρα καὶ τὸ κενόν, καὶ τὸ ὕδωρ εἰς τὴν γῆν καὶ τὸν αἶρα, καὶ ἡ γῆ εἰς τὸ ὕδωρ) we have <καὶ τὸν αἶρα>, of which the note says *conjectura addit Ma.* But in the physical scale of the Stoics (aether, air, water, earth) it is correct enough to say that aether is bounded by vacuum and air, air by aether and water, water by air and earth; but earth is the heaviest element occupying the centre and is bounded on all sides by water. It is curious that, on turning to Bake, we find in his note *omissimus καὶ τὸν αἶρα* (read by Balf.) *auctoritate MSS.* So in I. 2, p. 26, l. 20 <τὰ κατὰ τὰς> αὐξήσεις, the note has τὰ κατὰ τὰς *coniect. add. Ma.*, but Bake in his note states that it is read in a Bodleian MS. P. 28, l. 13 διὰ τί ἀντέσπραπται τὰ κατὰ τὰς ὥρας καὶ <τὰ κατὰ> τὰς

αὐξήσεις καὶ μειώσεις τῶν ἡμερῶν <τε καὶ νυκτῶν> τοῖς τὴν ἀντεύκρατον ἔχουσιν. Here the note has *uncis inclusa add. Ma.*, but in Bake I find *Balf. addit τε καὶ νυκτῶν*. The insertions however seem to me unnecessary. If they really formed a part of the original text, how are we to explain their repeated omission by the copyist in pp. 36, l. 21 τὰς αὐξήσεις καὶ μειώσεις ἡμερῶν <τε καὶ νυκτῶν>, 50, l. 15 αἱ δὲ αὐξήσεις <καὶ μειώσεις> τῶν ἡμερῶν τε καὶ νυκτῶν, 66 *bis* (ll. 16 and 19) μειώσεις τῶν ἡμερῶν <τε καὶ νυκτῶν>, 68, l. 4? Surely Cleomedes may be allowed to lighten his labours by dropping words which any intelligent reader would supply in an often recurring phrase.

I. 7, p. 65. Ziegler reads after Manitius δὲ γὰρ τοὺς ἀρκτικούς... γράφεσθαι πόλιν διαστήματι ἀπὸ τοῦ παρ' ἐκάστοις ὀρίζοντος. Bake reads, with all Ziegler's MSS. (except that one has πολλῶ for πόλῳ), γράφεσθαι πόλῳ καὶ διαστήματι τῷ παρ' ἐκάστοις ὀρίζοντι. Bake in his note says *solenis videtur mathematicorum locutio qua circuli magnitudinem indicent*, comparing among other passages Plut. *De Garrul.* 513 C ὡς κέντρῳ καὶ διαστήματι περιγράψαι τὴν ἀπόκρισιν, which is, I think, sufficient to prove the correctness of the reading πόλῳ καὶ διαστήματι. II. 1, p. 138, Cl. argues against the Epicurean view (that the sun is no bigger than it seems) from the fact that over the whole earth streets running east and west are free from shadow at sunrise: πάλιν δὲ κατὰ τὴν μεσημβρίαν πάντα περιφωτίζεται τὰ ἐν ὅλῃ τῇ οἰκουμένῃ <ἐρρημοτομημένα> ἄμφοδὰ <πρὸς μεσημβρίαν>. Omitting the words inserted by Manitius, the latter clause would mean that, 'at noon the streets (blocks of building) throughout the world are illuminated—the sun shines on all sides of them.' The words inserted seem to me not in accordance with *περιφωτίζεται*, which is apparently distinguished from ἄσκια ποιεῖ by Cl. A similar needless insertion is made in p. 140, l. 3 *περιφωτίσας τὰ <πρὸς αὐτὸν ὄρῶντα> ἄμφοδὰ*. The statement is probably not intended to be taken quite literally—*πλατύτερον λέγεται*, as Cl. says just below. Even with Z.'s emendation it does not become mathematically accurate; *e.g.* it is not true that, within the Arctic Circle, streets facing the south would be illuminated at noon in winter.

II. 1, p. 146. After stating that Posidonius had calculated the sun's orbit to be ten thousand times the circumference of the earth, Cl. continues: εἰ γὰρ ὁ <ἡλιακὸς> κύκλος τοῦ <τῆς γῆς> κύκλου μυριοπλασίον, καὶ τὸ

τμήμα τοῦ κύκλου, ὅπερ ἐπέχει τὸ τοῦ ἡλίου μέγεθος, μυριοπλάσιον εἶναι δεῖ τούτου τοῦ τμήματος τῆς γῆς, ὅπερ ὁ ἡλῖος κατὰ κορυφὴν ὑπερκείμενος ἄσκιον παρέχεται. The reading of the MSS. seems to me to put the argument more forcibly than Ziegler's reading. Similar doubtful emendations, as they seem to me, will be found in pp. 82, 84, 88.

Other readings which seem to me unsatisfactory are I. 1, p. 12, l. 13 καὶ οὐδὲ δύναται ἔξως ἀείρον εἶναι, which is translated *et ne potest quidem esse habitus corporis infinitus*. I can make sense of neither the Greek nor the Latin; but reading ἔξῃς, with Bake and Z.'s best MS., we get the excellent sense 'there can be no principle of cohesion of (in) an infinite substance': cf. p. 2, l. 15 ἀείρον οὐδενὸς φύσιν εἶναι δυνατόν. I. 1, p. 16, l. 3. If the outer void is limited, it must be circumscribed by something incorporeal: τί ἂν οὖν εἴη τοῦτο; χρόνος; ἐπιφάνεια; λεκτόν ἕτερόν τι τῶν παραπλησίων; ἀλλ' οὐκ εὐλογον κ.τ.λ. The translation given of λεκτόν is *Afferamus aliud his simile?* But it is plain, as Bake observes, that such a phrase comes in very awkwardly here. His suggestion is λεκτῶν, but we may be satisfied with the λεκτόν of one of Z.'s MSS. meaning 'abstraction.' The general sense will thus be 'What is to limit the all-surrounding void? Is it time, or superficies, or some other abstraction of the like kind?'¹

I do not of course deny that the text is occasionally improved, *e.g.* in I. 5, p. 42, l. 4, speaking of the parallels of latitude, Cl. says, according to the old reading, that the circles are smaller as they approach the pole: ὥστε οἱ μὲν ἀπὸ τούτων δεῖ πρὸς τὸν ἡμερινὸν ἰόντων γραφόμενοι μείζους πρὸς λόγον τῆς ἀπὸ τῶν πόλων ἀποστάσεως γενήσονται. Here Z. reads ἰόντες [γραφόμενοι], the latter word being a gloss, which got into the text, and required the alteration of ἰόντες into the genitive, in order to find some construction for it. So in p. 12, l. 20 πᾶν τὸ πεπερασμένον εἰς ἑτερογενὲς περατοῦται [καὶ ὁ ἐστὶν ἕτερον τοῦ πεπερασμένου], Z. is no doubt right in bracketing the last words as a gloss.

J. B. MAYOR.

¹ Mr. E. W. B. Nicholson has most kindly examined for me two of the Bodleian MSS. of Cleomedes, (a) Cromwell 12, ascribed by Mr. Coxe to the 15th or 16th century, (b) Selden B. 17 (Seld. 29 in Coxe's catalogue) ascribed to the beginning of the 16th century. In p. 12, l. 13 Z., both MSS. read ἔξῃς; in p. 16, l. 3, a has χρόνος, ἐπιφάνεια, λεκτόν. While b has χρόνος; ἐπιφάνεια; λεκτόν ἕτερόν τι κ.τ.λ.

QUILL'S HISTORY OF P. CORNELIUS TACITUS.

The History of P. Cornelius Tacitus. Translated into English with an Introduction and Notes critical and explanatory, by ALBERT WILLIAM QUILL, M.A., T.C.D., sometime scholar of Trinity College, Dublin. Vol. I. London: John Murray. 7s. 6d.

MR. QUILL is so fervent an admirer of Tacitus and so outspoken in his enthusiasm that it is a difficult and ungracious task to criticise him seriously: yet it must be admitted that as a translator he has not said the last word. In fact his very enthusiasm is a stumbling-block to him: it vitiates his style and disfigures his preface with rhapsodies and needless digressions: and with a conscientious desire to follow closely in the footsteps of his great original, Mr. Quill attempts to imitate the forms of the Tacitean sentence (an impossible feat in English), while he omits to reproduce the literal sense of the words, sacrificing mere fidelity to an often unsuccessful striving after epigram. The general result is that the translation is slipshod: not only where the Latin is really difficult, but even where it is quite easy. Thus *quamvis capite defectionis ablato* is rendered 'although he was gone': *superstitione ac lascivia discordem*, 'distracted by profligate superstition': *Capitonen occisum etiam qui queri non poterant tamen indignabantur*, 'there was much groundless indignation over Capito's death': while although there is no doubt a certain cleverness and 'modernity' in such renderings as 'born conservative' for *vultu habituque moris antiqui*, or 'neither slaves nor anarchists' for *qui nec totam servitutem pati possunt nec totam libertatem*, they do not at all reproduce the meaning. This same smartness occasionally degenerates into slang, as when Mr. Quill translates *in suspensio tenuit* by 'looked blank,' and uses such expressions as 'to square the troops,' 'featherbed soldier,' 'the legionary was tossed' (in a wrestling bout) 'and the Gaul rowed over him': and even a newspaper

scarcely speaks of 'the Vindex war,' 'the Caesar pedigree.' Slang and untidiness are the more objectionable when we find them side by side with such high-flown phrases as the rendering of *imperium cupientibus nihil medium inter summa et praecepta*—'the imperial votary hath no resting-place 'twixt pinnacle and perdition.' It should, however, be said that although there are certain faults from which the translator is never free,—a tendency to smartness and a very bad habit of modernising place-names,—still his version grows distinctly more faithful as he proceeds, the second book containing comparatively few instances of slovenliness: and no doubt the remaining books will show a like improvement.

Criticism is invited for some renderings which are especially noticed in the preface: of these it may be said that while *parata contio* (2. 79) may, but need not, mean a packed meeting, the suggestion of a nautical metaphor in *panderet modo sinum et venienti fortunae occurreret* ('crowd canvas towards approaching fortune') is ingenious and plausible. Several pages are devoted to an enthusiastic eulogy of Meiser's 'magnificent emendation'—*iniquis cupidine* for *quaestus cupidine* (2. 86). Here, 'by a stroke of the critic's pen, and in conformity with all the canons of modern criticism, a picture is conjured up, from the dusty parchment, of the past, full of life and beauty and originality. We now see the knight-errant in his true colours.....Such criticism breathes life into the past, and conjures up before the mind's eye visions of yore radiant with life and beauty.' What a delightful series of scenes must life present to the eye which can extract such aesthetic enjoyment from a various reading!

Mr. Quill is generally judicious in his choice of the text to be followed. His notes are based principally upon those of previous commentators: they are brief and to the point.

A. D. GODLEY.

SCHULTHESS ON CICERO *PRO C. RABIRIO*.

Der Prozess des C. Rabirius vom Jahre 63 v. Chr. von OTTO SCHULTHESS. Frauenfeld. J. Huber. 1891. Mk. 2.

THIS is a most thorough exposition of the legal and historical difficulties attaching to the so-called 'pro C. Rabirio *perduellionis reo oratio ad Quirites*.' The writer however does not profess to offer any final solution of his own. He examines in succession the views of Huschke, who, following Niebuhr, proved that the Speech was not made in a trial for *perduellio*: and of Wirz, who argues in favour of a tribunician trial for *perduellio*, combined with a fine-process or *multae irrogatio* in the same case; this he rightly pronounces an 'impossibility in procedure.' Next he discusses Schneider's attempt to explain away the words of § 8 in *eadem multae irrogatione* as a sort of proverbial expression 'in one judicial finding' i.e. 'in one breath' (!) and his view of § 10 *perduellionis iudicium a me sublatum*. In conclusion, the writer states his own opinions as to the procedure in this *cause célèbre*: which are essentially the same as those of Mr. Heitland, to whose excellent edition he frequently refers, an honour too often withheld from English editions by continental scholars. There are appendices on the method of appointing *duumviri perduellionis* and other matters. The writer's method is aggravating. It entails much vain repetition: why could he not have given each scholar's argument first, without comment or censure, and reserved himself for a final section? As it is, we have to discover the *disiecta membra* of Schneider up and down the book, and are only told on p. 50 for the first time that he is an advocate of *perduellio* pure and simple. It would indeed have been far more satisfactory, had Herr Schulthess thrown his treatise into the form of a commentary on certain passages of the Speech, with excursions on special points.

Mr. Heitland's introduction and appendices give English scholars almost all the results at present attained: so that it would be superfluous to enlarge upon them. I will notice one or two points for which this treatise is indispensable to a student of the 'pro C. Rabirio.'

On § 8 'nam quid ego ad id longam orationem comparem, quod est in eadem multae irrogatione perscriptum (codd. *praescriptum*), hunc nec suae nec alienae pudicitiae peper-

cisse?' The passage naturally interpreted compels us to the view that the trial was a fine-process; *eadem* refers not to the active and passive *impudicitia* alone, as Schneider supposes, but to all the charges of § 6-8 as comprised in one part of the indictment, while the other and main part (*illa altera pars* § 9) refers to the *rex Saturnini*. The first words of § 9, in which Cicero complains 'eo mihi semihoram ab Labieno praestitutam esse ut ne plura de pudicitia dicerem' are also in favour of a fine-process in the comitia tributa: for there the tribune would preside and not merely accuse, as in a case of *perduellio* before the centuries. Mr. Heitland says, 'the limitation was probably in any case an arbitrary act, but it was clearly based on the tribune's power of *intercessio*,' in which Herr Schulthess sees (p. 32 n. 2) self-contradiction: but 'arbitrary' power may be legal enough, and as Q. Hortensius had spoken at length (§ 18), the tribune thought fit to limit Cicero's periods. This brings us to an interesting point: the words of § 17 *liberum tempus nobis dabitur* cet. have been adduced in evidence that the Speech was not delivered at the last of the tribunician hearings usual in the fine-process. They refer doubtless, however, to a political encounter with Labienus in another place on some future occasion. (Cp. Heitland, p. 37, introd. E(f. ii.)⁵.) The strong language of §§ 5, 36, implying a present crisis for Rabirius, would decide us for the fourth and final hearing. Mommsen (R. St. iii. I. p. 358, n. 4) questions whether counter pleadings could take place at this hearing. Yet it is unlikely that after adjournment for a whole *trinum nundinum* the procedure was restricted to a bare vote by the tribes. In § 25 the words *numquam projecto istam imaginem...in rostra atque in contionem attulisses* should be referred more decisively than Mr. Heitland has done to a *contio* at one of the three previous hearings: compare *quam tu habes with quod habuit domi suae* of § 24 (Heitland); and observe that Cic. does not say in *hanc contionem*. (The mention of rostra shows that there can be no reference to a trial before the centuries, which would have been held in the Campus Martius. Cp. what was said above on § 9 on the part played by the tribune: and v. Momms. *l.c.* note 1.) § 10 *perduellionis iudicio quod a me sublatum esse criminari soles*: a fact to which there is no reference

in Dion Cassius xxxvii. 26-28: the words might possibly refer to the hauling down of the flag on the Janiculum by Metellus Celer; but more probably imply that during the *σπουδαὶ παραχόδεις καὶ φιλονεικίαι* which preceded the appointment in the first instance of duumvirs for perduellio, the Senate at Cicero's instance modified the ancient penalties of the 'lex horrendi carminis,' viz. the *carnifex crux vincla flagella*. This, Herr Schulthess conjectures (p. 46 and

Anhang 1), the Senate did in the exercise of its powers of 'Nomophylaky' in regard to a plebiscite commanding the praetor to nominate duumvirs. There is rhetorical exaggeration alike in Labienus' invective against the action of Cicero, and in Cicero's declamations upon the pains and penalties of perduellio, now antiquated and moreover irrelevant in a fine-process.

W. YORKE FAUSSET.

SCHANZ'S HISTORY OF ROMAN LITERATURE.

Geschichte der Römischen Litteratur, von MARTIN SCHANZ. (Second Part. From the End of the Republic 30 B.C., to Hadrian 117 A.D.) München 1892 [pp. 476: 8 marks.]

WE have here a meritorious but not over-successful attempt to accomplish a very difficult task. A handbook of Roman literature on this scale demands great mastery of details, an unflinching sense of method and proportion, and critical appreciation at once versatile and acute: a rare combination and apparently one not found in the author of this handbook. Undoubtedly his work contains a great deal of useful and valuable information; but in respect of completeness it is much inferior to Teuffel's well-known *History of Roman Literature* as re-edited by Prof. Schwabe and accessible to the English reader in the excellent translation of Prof. Warr, while if it be regarded as a selection, it cannot be relied on to present what is absolutely or relatively of most importance. As an illustration may be taken the treatment of an author for whom Prof. Schanz expresses a warm admiration. Ten pages are devoted to Propertius. Section 285 deals with his life. Most (not all) of the principal facts are given. But no mention is made of Maecenas; and we are told that his contemporaries are silent about his life. Ovid then was not one of his contemporaries. Some space might have been given to the literary relations of Propertius, and mention made of the very puzzling verbal coincidences between him and Virgil and Tibullus. In smaller type we have a discussion of the old question of the number of the books. This is sober though not original; but the theory of Baehrens (*praef.* pp. 41 *sqq.*) that ii. 6 to

13 (inclusive) do not belong to the second book ought not to have been passed over in silence. Of the next six pages (sections 286 to 288) nearly five are taken up with an account of the contents of the poems; this not very difficult task might for the purposes of a handbook have been despatched in a page, and valuable space have been gained for matter now omitted. The small type deals very shortly with the Cynthia attachment and its chronology, and the chronology of the poems. The writer believes against Lachmann and others that the last book was published by Propertius himself and he sees in the juxtaposition of poems 7 and 8 a mark of design. I have drawn from this juxtaposition the opposite conclusion. When we are told that an early death seems to have struck the singer's harp from his hand, we might at least have been warned that the natural interpretation of the passages in the younger Pliny referring to Passennus Paulus (mentioned in section 290) is that Propertius married and had at least one child. Section 289 deals with the 'Characteristik' of Propertius. The estimate is sympathetic but deficient in penetration and fails to give us an impression of the Propertian individuality. The small print of this section deals with the manuscripts and editions. All reference to that extinct volcano, the Groninganus, might have been omitted. The importance of the manuscripts collated by Baehrens does not seem to have been realized. That scholar made, it is true, a great mistake in depreciating the Neapolitanus; but in other respects his views will form a basis for all future research. The list of editions is chiefly remarkable for its defects. A bibliography which omits amongst others the editions of Passerat, Broemkhuysen, Volpi and Palmer,

is worthless. Professor Schanz might have learned better from M. Plessis whose *Études* he quotes. We conclude with a somewhat slight account of the poet's posthumous influence. The author regrets that to the modern world Propertius is 'eine wenig bekannte Grösse'; he thinks that what is required to remedy this is a 'geschmackvolle Nachdichtung, such as Buecheler has given specimens of.' The book of which this is taken as a specimen is certainly more readable than Teuffel. It is not so closely packed and shows more of the private interests of the author. Its fuller, more rhetorical and impressional exposition may prove attractive to readers who are repelled by Teuffel's somewhat bare and meagre sentences. But the advantage is dearly purchased. It is not easy, even if it be possible, for a writer on literature to exclude his predilections: but predilection exceeds all bounds when, for example, it allots eleven pages to the *Heroides* of Ovid and only three to the *Metamorphoses*, while two again are assigned to the pseudo-Virgilian *Culex* which contains about half as much as any one of the fifteen books of the latter.

The author's literary judgments frequently fail of being judicial; we can plainly hear the feeling vibrating through them. Lucan and Persius are repugnant to him. Their obvious immaturity does not move him to qualify his condemnation. 'We are glad' he writes of the latter, 'to lay the poet down.' It may be so; but this is the tone of the unwilling reader, not the critical historian. And it follows that their high place in the judgment of their countrymen

is left a problem without a solution. Where feeling does not interfere, Prof. Schanz's critical utterances are rather safe than profound or acute. He presents the obvious or the accepted view without generally venturing beyond. Hence the portraits of the most remarkable geniuses convey an impression of superficiality and insufficiency. We feel this in reading his estimate of the genius of Tacitus. His Livy is better. Martial's great poetical qualities he appears very imperfectly to realize. For his abuse of them he offers a poor and wholly ineffective apology. If there ever was a man who sold filth and flattery, knowing them to be such, that man was Martial. On the *Epistles* of Horace, one of the best touch-stones of the literary critic, Prof. Schanz passes the following estimate, which I quote in the original, as a fair example of his results, only italicizing what is especially significant of the writer. 'Auf beiden Gebieten' (literature and life) 'werden uns die köstlichsten Schätze mitgeteilt. Man wird ausser Goethes Faust kaum ein Werk nennen können das so viel zu den geflügelten Worten beigetragen hat als Horazens Briefe. Sie sind das reifste Denkmal seiner Poesie, sie gehören zu den edelsten Erzeugnissen der römischen Dichtung, sie sind und werden bleiben so lange eine höhere Kultur besteht, ein anmutiges Lebensbrevier, das reden anziehen wird der die Kunst des Lebens zu würdigen weiss.' This is high praise and the *Epistles* of Horace deserve high praise; but is it the right kind?

J. P. POSTGATE.

RIESE'S GERMANY IN ANCIENT LITERATURE.

Das Rheinische Germanien in der antiken Litteratur. von ALEXANDER RIESE. Teubner, 8, 1892; viii. + 496 pp. Mk. 14.

This is a most useful book. It contains all the passages in ancient literature which describe or refer significantly to the history, geography, and civilization of Roman Germany, carefully arranged under suitable heads and minutely indexed. It does not present much that is absolutely new, but it gives us something much better. At last we have all the important literary evidence sorted and put into one volume. We are spared the labour of hunting through endless

editions, and overhauling the *Monumenta Historiæ Germaniæ*, or the Vienna *Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum*. We have one handy volume, in which our authorities stand face to face for search or comparison. It goes without saying that the extracts are mostly cut very short. Tacitus' narratives of Germanicus' campaigns are given only in excerpts from the important parts, and therefore it will still to some extent be necessary to consult the originals. But for historical reference the book is as good as it could be, and the Rhenish scholar who went through the labour of composing it has made a most valuable contribution to the study of Roman

and of German history. It were much to be hoped that others in other parts of what was the Roman Empire would follow his example. For Britain the labour would not be great, and I hope that some day I may (in default of abler scholars) try to fill the gap, though,

indeed, more has been done already for our province than had been done anywhere else previously to the issue of Dr. Riese's admirable book.

F. HAVERFIELD.

DE NOLHAC ON PETRARCH AND THE HUMANISTS.

De Nollac's Pétrarque et l'Humanisme. Vol. 91 in *Bibliothèque de l'École des Hautes Études.* Paris. 1892.

THE readers of M. de Nollac's *Bibliothèque de Fulvio Orsini* will require no other advertisement to procure and read his new volume. The same extraordinary knowledge of libraries and MSS. distinguishes both works; a knowledge almost unique and proportionably valuable. But whereas the *Library of F. Orsini* dealt principally with the sixteenth and somewhat less with the fifteenth centuries, the new volume is mainly occupied with the century which started the Renaissance, the fourteenth. Of that century the first literary name is Petrarch. It is not however with that side of Petrarch's activity by which he is most widely known, his poetry, that M. de Nollac deals: but with his equally important rôle as the earliest, and in some ways greatest, of Humanists. An Erasmus, it is true, could talk slightly of a predecessor before whom his own light pales more and more; but Italy may smile as she reflects that, while the contemptuous words of the *Ciceronianus* (quoted on p. 90), 'reflorescentis eloquentiae princeps apud Italos uidetur fuisse Petrarca, sua aetate celebris ac magnus, nunc uix est in manibus,' are disproved by the ever-increasing interest which attaches to every detail of Petrarch's life, not more as poet than as humanist and reviver of classical literature, not even the greatness of the religious struggle in which Erasmus bore a conspicuous part, not even the excellences of much that he wrote, can do more than assign to him a secondary place among the lasting lights of literature.

The poet tells a story of his boyhood which forms, so to speak, an anticipation of his future life. His father had thrown into the fire some of the books which he read for amusement to solace the dreariness of his law studies: among them Virgil and a volume containing some of the

oratorical treatises of Cicero. Petrarch burst into tears, and his father relenting drew from the flames the two volumes, telling him he might keep them; the one to beguile his leisure moments, the other to help him in the prosecution of law. In the minute account which M. de Nollac gives of Petrarch's classical studies, these two authors bear the foremost place.

The Ambrosian Library of Milan possesses a MS., written on 269 leaves early in the fourteenth century, containing the *Bucolics*, *Georgics*, *Aeneid* with Servius' commentary; scholia on the *Achilleis* of Statius, then the poem itself, followed by some Odes of Horace. This MS. was Petrarch's, and one of the earliest he possessed; it was stolen from him in 1326 and restored in 1338 when he was at Avignon, for so a note informs us in his own handwriting. It shared his travels, spite of its size and heaviness, and bears the traces of his prolonged and continuous study in a thick mass of notes with which he has filled its text and margins. It exhibits the ingenuity and elaborate learning of the humanist from many different sides: not only such as directly touch the poems, e.g. history and geography, but less directly, as in moral or religious reflections bearing on his own contemporaries, and occasionally as suggesting a symbolic or allegorical meaning which must have been quite alien from Virgil's thoughts. A most amusing, nay almost laughable specimen of this kind is to be found on pp. 122-3, where over the text of *Ecl. i.* Petrarch has written a running explanation, of which the following are samples:—

Rome	discipulos tecum uersatos
hic,	inter flumina nota
magistros ex quibus	umbrosam et repositum
flumina sunt	studium
Et fontes sacros,	frigus captabis opacum

and

materia de amoribus
sunt nobis mitia poma

satyrica yrsuta	artificio	uel moralis scientia
de se	scilicet	uel ars aliqua
Castaneae	molles et pressi	copia lactis

[ex multorum preceptorum ad unum finem tendentium, uel preter romana ystoria aliqua ex multorum actuum quadam uelut coagulatione composita.

Instances of historical and geographical notes will be found on pp. 125-128; of metrical remarks on p. 129; for Petrarch was a careful observer of deviations from ordinary prosody, and illustrated them in his Virgil by examples taken from other Latin poets; Propertius is twice quoted from this point of view. Of the extent of his reading the list of authors, which fills pp. 131-132, is a voucher; these are all cited in the margin of the Virgil. They have been written in inks of different colours and times: for not even the suspicion of magic, which his constant perusal of the Mantuan poet brought down upon Petrarch at the papal court of Avignon, could frighten him from his favourite study; and he seems to have been one of the first who openly professed himself a disbeliever in this popular and widely diffused tradition of the Middle Age. In this respect he was in advance, not only of his time, but of one of his most enlightened friends, Boccaccio.¹ M. de Nolhac recounts a dialogue (p. 109) between Petrarch and King Robert of Sicily, in which, on the king asking him whether he believed that Virgil had pierced by art magic, as currently reported, the tunnel of Piedigrotta at Naples, the poet replied, amidst a large circle of bystanders, that he had nowhere read that Virgil was a magic-monger; and the passage from whence this is quoted goes on to suggest, as the poet's own explanation of the legend, that the end of the tunnel was very near the traditional site of Virgil's tomb. Not less in advance of his age was his view that the 4th Eclogue was not a prophecy of Christ; as this was a prevailing belief of the Middle Age, and has its supporters still, we may admire his courage not less than his advanced training.

Of Cicero Petrarch was not only a fervent admirer, as the address to him, quoted p. 175, proves, *O Romani eloquii summe parens, nec solus tibi ego, sed omnes gratias agimus, quicumque latinae linguae floribus ornatur*, &c., but an indefatigable resuscitator. No chapter of M. de Nolhac's book is so interesting as that in which he recounts the details of these recoveries, or discoveries,

of Ciceronian works at that time little read or known, and of life-long attempts to find what has remained hidden to the present day. At a comparatively early period of his life Petrarch seems to have interested himself, his friends, and patrons, in a more or less systematic research for everything written by Cicero. The popes at Avignon, doubtless following his guidance, strove to enrich their libraries with copies of the orator's works. Clement VI. begged Petrarch to arrange his MSS. of Cicero for him, and in 1351 addressed a request to the Bishop of Valence for copies. The inventory of Urban V. (1369) contains four volumes of Cicero, one of them thus described, *Libri Tullii multi qui raro inveniuntur, in uno magno volumine*. Gregory XI. in 1374 requested a canon of Paris to inform him what works of Cicero were in the library of the Sorbonne, and to procure him good copies of them. Petrarch himself states (p. 182) that he had spared neither money nor prayers in the attempt to find new and good MSS. of Cicero, and this not only in Italy, where he was well known, but in France, Germany, Spain, and even Greece. Each successive journey brought him something new. *Mihi quidem uix unquam peregrinatio longior suscepta est, ubi non incognitos Ciceronis ne dicam libros, sed inaudita librorum nomina comperiam*. In 1333, whilst on a visit to Liège, he fell in with two works which at that time he had not yet seen; one of them was the *pro Archia*; and his discovery resulted in the speech being copied, sent home, and read by the friends in whom his own ardour roused a similar emulation. In 1344 he was at Bologna and ill; among the books scattered about his bed was the *de Finibus* (p. 183). The following year he copied with his own hands, seemingly in the Capitular Library of Verona, the Epistles to Atticus; a discovery which must rank with the greatest made by the Humanists. The MS. appears to have contained, besides the sixteen books of letters to Atticus, the three to Q. Cicero, the correspondence of Cicero with Brutus, and the apocryphal letter of Octavianus. In 1350, on his way back from Rome to Florence, Petrarch visited his friend Lapo da Castiglionchio, and borrowed from his library a MS. which he kept for four years by him, hoping to find a competent transcriber. A letter from Vaucluse, written while this MS. was at Petrarch's house, informs us that it contained the *pro Milone*, *pro Plancio*, *pro Sulla*, and *de imperio Cn. Pompeii*. Lapo also supplied the poet

¹ Is it not time that Comparetti's classical work on Virgil in the Middle Age should find an English translator?

with a copy of the *Philippics*: probably with several other works of Cicero.

The Municipal Library of Troyes contains a large MS. of Cicero (No. 552) which must have belonged to Petrarch. It was written in the first half of the fourteenth century and is filled, like the Virgil, with scholia in Petrarch's handwriting. The first 122 leaves are filled with St. Jerome's commentary on the Book of Job; then follows a life of Cicero by an unknown writer (it is given at length by De Nohac, pp. 190-194), and the following series of his works: (1) *De Officiis*; (2) *Tusc. Quaest.*; (3) *De Natura Deorum*; (4) *De Divinatione*; (5) *De Fato*; (6) *De Amicitia*; (7) *De Senectute*; (8) *Paradoxa*; (9) *Acad. Prior. Liber II. siue Lucullus*; (10) *De Oratore*; (11) *Partitiones*; (12) *In Catilinam*; (13) *Pro Marcello*; (14) *Pro Ligario*; (15) *Pro Rege Deiotaro*; (16 and 17) The two spurious *Controversiae Salustii adversus Ciceronem* and *Ciceronis adversus Salustium*; (18) *Cum Populo gratias egit*; (19) *Cum Senatui gratias egit*; (20) *De Fato* (a duplicate); (21) *De Legibus*. The list omits the *Orator*, part of which however (xxvii. to end) is included in the *De Oratore*. The lacuna occasioned by this caused Petrarch to believe erroneously that the *De Oratore* was an imperfect work. The MS. originally contained two other works besides, (22) *Ad Herennium*; (23) *De Inventione*. It must have been in Petrarch's possession towards the middle of his life; most of his scholia are in a writing which M. de Nohac recognizes as after 1344 (see note on p. 194), and it would thus seem to be probably the text of Cicero which he used ordinarily when at Vacluse. This is confirmed by the agreement of the list of works given above with the description of the illustrious companions of his solitude on the banks of the Sorgue, whom he catalogues in a letter to Lapo da Castiglione, dated April, 1352. The names are just those that figure in the various works of Cicero contained in the MS. But other MSS. containing works of Cicero have been identified bearing notes which show that they had been used by Petrarch. One of them is a MS. of the twelfth century, Paris, 5802, containing *Philippics* i.-iv., and the *Tusculan Questions*. This latter work was a great favourite with the poet; the quotations he makes from it are more numerous than from any other treatise of Cicero, and he confesses in a passage which will interest many sufferers from gout and rheumatism that he found nothing more effica-

cious in relieving the pains caused by these afflicting maladies than a perusal of the second of the five books of the *Tusculans*. *Illum in manibus habeam, quotiens notis indicis aduentare podagricum senseris dolorem*. On the other hand, the *Philippics* have also been studied with particular care, and corrections written in the margin, whether proceeding from Petrarch's own divination, or obtained from other MSS. which rival the most certain specimens of emendation; and of which M. de Nohac gives some very interesting samples (p. 205). Neither the *Orator* nor the *Brutus* were really read by Petrarch; the allusions to them are drawn from other sources. It was not till 1422 that they were unearthed by Bishop Landriani, transcribed and circulated through Italy by Barsizza and Flavio Biondo.

The *De Republica* and *Consolatio* were a life-long, but disappointed object of Petrarch's researches. He despaired ultimately of meeting with either. It was reserved for another Italian, the great Cardinal Mai, to find the former lurking under a palimpsest copy of St. Augustine on the Psalms; and that not till the present century! The *Consolatio* first published at Venice in the sixteenth century is now generally believed to be a forgery of Sigonius. The style indeed is very Ciceronian, and I can remember no less a critic than Max Müller declaring that he had read it with no idea that it was not by Cicero: but though its ascription to Sigonius appears to me to rest on rather insecure evidence, the absence of any existing MS. makes it impossible to say whether its genesis can be traced to an earlier period. For my own part I am unwilling to allow that so great a scholar as Sigonius could have been the forger of this pleasing and admittedly clever imitation, on the bare authority of a supposed death-bed confession! For such is the statement of Latinus Latinus in a letter written from Rome towards the close of the sixteenth century.

In the *De Officiis* ii. 9 Cicero says he had written two books *De Gloria*. It has long been a question among scholars whether there is any real reason for believing that these existed in the Middle Age, and the usual opinion, based on a passage of Petrarch's letters, is that they did. Petrarch in a letter to his friend Luca della Penna, in which he speaks of his MSS. of Cicero, makes the following statement: '*Ab hoc (Soranzo) habui et Varronis et Ciceronis aëlia; cuius unum volumen de communibus fuit sed inter ipsa communia libri de Oratore*

ac de Legibus imperfecti, ut fere semper inveniuntur, et praeterea singulares libri duo de Gloria, quibus uisis me ditissimum aestimaui.' The poet goes on to tell how a man much in his confidence and who had been his instructor from boyhood had, under the pressure of poverty, carried off not only other valuable books and chattels but the very MS. containing the *De Gloria* (pp. 216, 217). The pawned treasure could never be recovered, though Petrarch made continual applications for it not only during the life of his indigent instructor, but after his death. It was thus, if Petrarch's story may be credited, extant in the earlier part of the poet's life: and traces of it are said to be found in the following two centuries. Philelfus, it is said, and Alcionius both drew from it for their writings. M. de Nolhac, who has examined the question with more minute knowledge of the facts than any of his predecessors, has arrived at an opposite conclusion. He believes that neither Philelfus nor Alcionius nor Petrarch ever had the work in their possession. As to Philelfus, the statement that he had it does not rest on contemporaneous evidence. Alcionius, living in a time when the discovery of a new classic was one of the surest avenues to wealth and distinction, would surely have published the text of such a treasure, if he had had it before him. And where did he find his supposed MS. of the *De Gloria*? In the possession (it is asserted) of Bernardo Giustiniani, himself an eminent bibliophile, and son of a distinguished humanist, Leonardo Giustiniani. How improbable that either of these savans should have failed to take special note of a work so well known to have been written by Cicero and so well known to have been lost, if they had really had it in their collection!¹ As to Petrarch, the Latin letter above quoted was written in extreme old age; and it seems far from improbable that his failing

¹ I think it possible that Alcionius did really work up some professedly Ciceronian excerpts, on *Gloria*, such as are found in some of the collections of moral extracts which were not unfrequent in the Middle Age. I have myself seen in the Bodleian a large *Deffloratio* which included, if my memory does not deceive me, such excerpts and on this very subject.

memory dressed up some slight basis of fact, possibly some extracts *De Gloria*, into an imaginary whole, which his knowledge of the passage in the *De Officiis* presented to him as Cicero's lost treatise in two books. At any rate, in the letter to Cicero where Petrarch speaks of his extant and of his lost works, he specially includes in these latter the *De Gloria*: 'tuorum sane (librorum) quorum insignior iactura est, haec sunt nomina; Rei publicae, Rei familiaris, Rei militaris, de laude philosophiae, de Consolatione, de Gloria quamvis de his ultimis spes magis dulcis quam desperatio certa sit.'

In the above sketch I have attempted to give some idea of the minute pains which M. de Nolhac has taken to make out every detail of the great Humanist's life as such. This however is but a very small portion of the fund of information which the book contains. Most of the great and some of the less known Latin authors were read by Petrarch, and many of them have notes in his writing, still extant in the margin of the MSS. he used. But to some readers the chapter describing his Greek studies will be even more interesting; for indeed Humanism lay far more in the resuscitation of Greek than in the recovery of Roman writings long lost or forgotten. But Petrarch did not live long enough to see more than the dawn of the Greek Renaissance; the Plato which he early acquired remained a sealed book to his latest days, and when at last he found an expositor of Homer in the person of Leo Pilatus, he had occasion to complain that the instruction he got from him was too often that of an only half-trained scholar.

If the utility of classical—especially of Greek—studies is becoming every year a more disputed question, a book like the one before us may be considered specially opportune. The pleasure with which I have read Petrarch's life-long efforts to recover the lost writers of Rome, and understand, however imperfectly, Greek, is, I must confess, occasionally crossed by the intruding thought that the new era threatens to have as little as it can of either.

ROBINSON ELLIS.

MÜLLER'S HISTORICAL GRAMMAR OF THE GREEK LANGUAGE.

Historische Grammatik der Hellenischen Sprache; von Dr. H. C. MÜLLER. Leiden. Brill. 1891.

THIS work consists of two parts—a historical grammar, together with chapters on the pronunciation of Greek, on mediaeval and modern Greek literature, and other subjects; and a chrestomathy, containing extracts from Greek authors from the Homeric age to the present day. Of the former of these, the grammar, we are obliged to say that it is very disappointing, for a historical Greek grammar is a great desideratum, and what is here presented to us is in reality nothing of the kind. The true method to be pursued in such a grammar is to trace the history of the changes to which the forms in the accidence, and the usages in the syntax, have in the course of time been subjected; to show in each case the origin of the variation, and to follow its gradual development and expansion from the earliest to the latest period, illustrating throughout by examples and quotations. How this may be done for the syntax in the early period of the *κοινή διάλεκτος* and in Hellenistic Greek, has been excellently shown on a small scale by Prof. Jebb in his essay on 'The Relation of Modern to Classical Greek,' appended to the second edition of Vincent and Dickson's *Handbook of Modern Greek*. Instead of doing this, Dr. Müller has given us the paradigm of each declension or other group of forms, as it appears (1) in the cultivated modern language, (2) in the popular modern language, (3) in Attic, (4) in the Homeric dialect, or, as he calls it, 'Homerische Volkssprache'—a misnomer surely, when applied to an idiom which was carefully elaborated for use in poetry. Now the first of these, the language of the modern Greek press and of the higher prose writing, whatever its merits may be, can hardly be regarded as possessing historical value, because it is in the main a creation of the last half century, in so far as it differs from the popular language—that is, not the dialects, but the traditional language of conversation, as it is used, with more or less purity, by all classes of Greeks. The language of Homer also, from its dialectic character, is of little service in illustrating the later developments of Greek grammar, or at least requires great caution when so

applied. To take an instance of Dr. Müller's method: his first example is *χώρα*, as a specimen of feminines in *-a*; here the forms of the modern cultivated language are identical with those in Attic, and the Homeric forms are the corresponding ones in the Old Ionic, so that hardly anything is gained by the comparison. In the masculines of the same declension it is a serious error to class together in the popular language words like *παππᾶς*, plur. *παππάδες* and *κλέφτης*, plur. *κλέφταις*, simply because they end in *as*, *ης*; the former of these belongs to a separate declension, as Dr. Müller himself elsewhere remarks (p. 65). Again, in treating the verbs, it is hard to see what is gained for historical purposes by giving different lists of irregular verbs for different periods of the language; nor does it add much to our knowledge to be told that the meaning of the Homeric *τέθηπα* is expressed at the present day by *ἐκπέπληγμαι*, or that of *χάζομαι* by *ὑποχωρῶ*, or that of *γέγονα* by *ἐξακουστός γίνομαι βοῶν*. Indeed, throughout the whole work we look in vain for any systematic treatment of the subject, and the author has an unfortunate tendency to introduce superfluous information, especially in the notes, sometimes when it is quite alien to the matter on hand. There is, no doubt, a large amount of curious learning to be found in his book, and a great wealth of references to other writers on points of detail. But even here Dr. Müller's statements require to be received with caution. Thus *σπίτι*, the Modern Greek for 'house,' is derived, not, as he says (p. 80), from the Italian *ospizio*, but, as its form shows, from the Latin *hospitium*, which appears early in mediaeval Greek as *ὁσπίτιον* or *ὁσπήτιον*. And in the account of the Modern Greek dialects at the end of Part II. we note, that not a few forms which are almost universal in the mouths of the common people in Greece, are mentioned as peculiar to certain districts; thus *ᾶξω* for *ἔξω* is described as Epirotic, *πῶμμα* for *πᾶμμα* as Cretan, &c. Indeed, this part of the work teems with mistakes.

It is a pleasure now to turn to the chrestomathy, the passages in which are well selected, and serve to give the reader a good idea of the various phases through which the Greek language has passed. The extracts from the principal classical writers,

as they require no explanation for scholars, are accompanied, with a view to comparison, by translations in Modern Greek, and the ancient swallow-song from Athenaeus is paralleled by its modern counterpart. In the post-classical period Plutarch, the New Testament, Lucian and Julian are represented; and a place is found for the last-named emperor's witty, though most uncomplimentary, epigram on beer. The early Byzantine literature is illustrated by selections from the famous hymn-writer Romanos, and by extracts from Malalas, Theophanes and Constantine Porphyrogenitus for the more popular style of prose writing, and from the learned Photius for the more cultivated style. The tenth century introduces the extensive literature of the poetical romances in the vulgar tongue, the earliest specimen of which is the Byzantine epic of Digenes Akritas, some being of native growth, while others were imitated from similar compositions in Western Europe. Along with selections from these, Dr. Müller has furnished extracts from the collection of beautiful

love-poems which form the so-called 'Alphabet of Love,' from the curious metrical 'Chronicle of the Morea,' which relates the achievements of the Frank invaders of that country after the Fourth Crusade, and from Emmanuel Georgillas' poem 'The Plague of Rhodes.' For specimens of the poetic art during the three centuries that succeeded the Turkish conquest the romantic Cretan poem of Erotocritus, the drama of Erophile in the same dialect, and the early Romaic ballads, are laid under contribution. Again, to exemplify the various phases through which prose writing passed from the time of Anna Comnena onwards, passages are given from authors of various dates, until we reach the works of Coray at the end of the last century, with whom the modern renaissance commences. Finally, a short anthology from the best poets of the present century is furnished, from which the reader may learn how rich this literature is, and prose extracts to illustrate the different styles that prevail at the present day.

H. F. TOZER.

BUSOLT'S GREEK ANTIQUITIES.

Handbuch der Klassischen Alterthums-Wissenschaft, herausgegeben von Dr. IWAN MÜLLER. 4te Band, 1ste Abtheilung, 1 Hälfte. *Die Griechischen Staats- und Rechtsalterthümer*, von Dr. GEORG BUSOLT. 2te umgearbeitete und sehr vermehrte Auflage. München. Beck. 1892. (pp. 384, 6 mk. 50 pf.)

DR. BUSOLT'S clearness of exposition, accuracy and learning have made the first edition of this work one of the most useful text-books on Greek political antiquities. The appearance of the second edition requires especial notice; it has been so much expanded and so large a portion has been rewritten that nearly half of the new edition is new work. It contains now 384 pages instead of 222. It is moreover the first important work in which the new evidence on the Athenian Constitution has been fully used. This has necessitated a complete rewriting of most of this section, which has now become one of the fullest and most important treatises on the Athenian Constitution.

In using the *Ἀθηναίων Πολιτεία* the author

has been very successful. As the book was finished in August of last year, the work must have been done with great rapidity, and he has not been able to make much use of the later literature. He accepts the treatise as Aristotelian and in nearly all points follows it. Only in extreme cases, as e.g. in the notorious story about Themistocles and in the false date at the beginning of ch. 41 (ἐπὶ Πυθοδώρον), does he reject its authority. In the account of the 400 and of the 30 he follows Aristotle even when he differs from the contemporary writers Thucydides and Xenophon (p. 173, n. 4; p. 174, n. 6). Relying on the absence of any mention of this office in Aristotle he dates the institution of τῶν ἐπὶ τῇ διοίκησει to shortly before 308, instead of the earlier period formerly accepted. The new account of the introduction and history of the Archonship, the reforms of Solon and Aristides are accepted; and even the full account of the Draconian constitution is put into the text, although in a note he recognizes the difficulties which his exposition does not remove. It is however in the descriptive portion that the value of

the new material is most obvious. There has been a tendency in England to undervalue it; the real gain will be best appreciated by reading a chapter like that on the officials. Innumerable small *lacunae* are filled up, and points of dispute are settled; many bold conjectures which could formerly find no place in a book like this are confirmed. However much still remains doubtful, fragmentary as our knowledge still is, the amount of information that can be given as certain is very largely increased.

One of the merits of the book is that the author generally knows how to distinguish between ascertained truth and conjecture; he avoids the common mistake of quoting the latest theory as a fact. The chapter on the *φρατρίαι*, which has been rewritten in the light of new inscriptions and some new works on the subject, does not appear quite free from this fault. The statement that after the time of Cleisthenes the *φρατρίαι* 'erhielten eine höhere staatsrechtliche Bedeutung' must be considered still problematical. Two other minor points I may refer to. The explanation of the number of the *ἐφέται* given on p. 143 as '3 times 17 or 3 times $4 \times 4 + 1$ '—a number founded on 'a combination of the number of the courts with that of the tribes, one being added'—is certainly no less unsatisfactory than previous numerical explanations of the kind. On p. 136 the positive statement is made that the *ἐκρήμοροι* received one-sixth of the produce. This on general grounds is very improbable, if not impossible; and the words of Aristotle are decidedly in favour of the other view.

In the other parts of the work there are very considerable additions. There is a new paragraph in § 57 on the methods of arbitrating between states. In § 62 etc. the account of the administration of the Delian and Delphian temples and Amphiktyonies has been altered and enlarged, chiefly from the materials supplied by the French excavators. In the account of the Cleruchies, § 80, and the history of the 2nd Athenian Confederacy he has also been able to avail

himself of fresh material. The most important additions however are in the sections dealing with the different federations: that on Thessaly is almost entirely new, new sections are added on the other tribal unions of Northern Greece, and at the end important chapters are added dealing with the Boeotian, Achæan and Aetolian Confederacies, which in the first edition were completely omitted.

The work is therefore now more complete than it was. There still remain however considerable *lacunae*. Very little information is given about the secondary states; towns such as Argos, Corinth, Syracuse and Miletus are only casually referred to in the 1st chapter on the general development of the state; in no part of the work is there any separate description of them. Some space might have been gained for this by the omission of a good deal of purely historical matter which is inserted in the descriptions of the Achæan and Boeotian leagues. It is surely a serious breach of proportion to devote 25 pages to Achæa and Aetolia and say nothing at all about Cyrene, Sicily, Italy and the states of Asia Minor. Moreover in a work which professes to deal not only with *Staats-* but also with *Rechts-Alterthümer* we are justified in looking for some information on legal matters: with the exception of a short account of the Gortynian code these are omitted. There is a full account of Attic procedure but none of Attic Law. Even though our knowledge of Greek Law is too fragmentary to form a regular treatise, a clear statement of what is known on the laws of inheritance and adoption, and the forms of land tenure and marriage would have added very greatly to the value of the work. These omissions are the more to be regretted because of the very high quality of the work both in form and matter. It will doubtless not be long before a third edition will be required, and an opportunity will be given of making it more complete than it is now.

J. W. HEADLAM.

KRUMBACHER'S LEGENDS RELATING TO S. THEODOSIUS.

Studien zu den Legenden des S. Theodosios, by KARL KRUMBACHER (from the *Sitzungsber. of the Akad. d. Wiss.*, Munich; separately printed, 1892).
NO. LIX. VOL. VII.

THE title of this book gives a most inadequate idea of the important matters which it contains. It is well known what valuable historical and philological in-

formation springs to the light wherever Usener digs in the vast field of Hagiology. Krumbacher, the historian of the Byzantine Literature, has given us a sequel to Usener's work on the Life of S. Theodosius (†529). Usener had published it from a Laurentian MS. (11th cent.), whose readings he had recorded with the most careful minuteness. Krumbacher has found several other MSS., three of which belong to the 10th cent. Thus, much of Usener's acute emendation is confirmed, and new light is shed on the text. But the real interest and importance of K.'s work lies in the disclosure of method in regard to the collection of MS. evidence and the editing of post-classical texts, and in the lexicographical and other studies with which he has enriched us.

1. In dealing with the MSS. of short treatises it is always important to note the surroundings in which they lie: the other books which occur in the same volume are often a guide to the genealogical relations of the text. K. distinguishes three grades of Greek Hagiological MSS.: (1) texts prior to the extraordinary activity of Symeon the Metaphrast in embellishing and resetting the old jewels; these are found in considerable volumes, especially of the 10th and 11th centuries, sometimes arranged according to the Calendar, and sometimes not: (2) the Metaphrast's enlarged texts: (3) abbreviated texts of the Basilian Menology and the Menaea. This division is of course recognized; but what is fresh in K.'s treatment is the urgency with which he pleads for a systematic examination of the first group. The Catalogues of MSS. do not distinguish these from the second: a list of them would be of the greatest value, and it might ultimately be followed by a printed Corpus of these early texts, out of which precious treasures of history and geography would be dug by many scholars following the lead of Usener and Krumbacher and Ramsay.

2. Under the head of Remarks on the Text K. takes occasion to discuss the difficulty in which an editor of any post-classical text, and especially of a mediaeval text, finds himself through the lack of any standard by which to distinguish peculiar forms to be assigned to the author from peculiar forms which are due to his copyists. Polybius and Josephus have suffered grievously at the hands of editors who insisted that certain 'barbarisms' (i.e. forms or constructions which they assumed to be barbarous because they do not occur within the narrow range of our extant classical

literature) must necessarily have been introduced by later scribes: and K. draws a terrible picture of the torture of the Church-poet Romanus by his recent editor Pitra who, without a sound knowledge of Classical Greek on his own part, undertook to reform Romanus against the plainest and most consistent documentary evidence. This section of K.'s work is a mine of valuable materials and references, and illustrates again and again the value of a wide reading in later Greek and some acquaintance with the spoken language of to-day in dealing with Greek texts of any period. Here again he cries out for more workers in a vast and untilled field: statistics of unusual forms and constructions found in MSS. must be collected and digested: the result might be at length a 'Grammar of Manuscripts,' or more fully 'A Grammar based on historically arranged statistics of the Hellenistic *κοινή*, the Byzantine literary language, and Vulgar Greek.' Here is scientific work of the most important character for those of our Classical scholars who are willing to awake from the dream that the Greek language died some time before the Christian Era. To students of the history of language such work would be beyond all price.

3. In a long succession of notes on Usener's text in the light of the newly recovered MSS., K. illustrates the application of his critical principles. The lexicographical notes on *καταδέχομαι* (pp. 286 ff.) and *ἀνάρτω* (p. 297) should not be lost sight of: and the whole of this section will repay study.

4. The Hymnologist now has his turn. The relation of Church Hymns and Poems to the Legends is discussed, and a long hymn to S. Theodosius is given from a Patmos MS., with variants from two others.

5. The Third, Ninth and Fortieth days after Death were those to which special memorials belonged in the Eastern Church. This custom was founded on the pre-Christian observance of the Third, Ninth and Thirtieth days. In the Western Church the Seventh took the place of the Ninth, as in the Eastern Church the Fortieth displaced the Thirtieth. The grounds given for the Eastern selection of days are discussed by K., who prints two short tracts *περί γενέσεως κ.τ.λ.*, in which a physiological basis is found for the custom in the periods of the development of the embryo. This explanation, typical of the mediaeval age, displaced the earlier scriptural explanations. Each of these texts has an elaborate critical

apparatus, for K. is true to his implied principle that no facts can be unimportant.

6. The *σήμενον*, which all visitors to Patmos cherish among their liveliest recollections, and over which K. becomes rhetorical for the first time, almost poetical, is an instrument for summoning the monks to the Church at 1 A.M. A piece of suspended wood beaten by the Deacon with a bar of iron frightens sleep away by its cruel din. K. says that after his first night he never dared to go to bed till its last sound had died away: he had the exceptional advantage of having it in the corridor just

outside his cell. He may have said things about it at the time which he regretted afterwards: if so he presents a propitiation in the form of a collection of epigrams and other allusions in which τὸ ἅγιον σήμενον is again and again most aptly compared to the Archangel's Trumpet of Doom.

7. Several useful notes, e.g. on the interchange of εἰς and ἐν, on uses of καταλαμβάνω, on beans and on locusts, bring to its close this most excellent series of studies.

J. ARMITAGE ROBINSON.

JAMES'S TESTAMENT OF ABRAHAM.

Texts and Studies, Vol. II. No. 2. *The Testament of Abraham*, by MONTAGUE RHODES JAMES, M.A., with an appendix by W. E. BARNES, B.D. Cambridge University Press, 1892. Pp. 166.

THE contributors to this admirable series continue to earn the gratitude of scholars, both by the selection of the material which they put forth, and by the manner in which they treat it. The importance of pseudepigraphic literature, whether Jewish or Christian, was (until comparatively lately) not sufficiently recognized by students of Judaism and Christianity. It is now, however, receiving its full share of attention; and the present volume is a worthy contribution to this wide and varied subject. In his preface the editor of the *Testament of Abraham* points out that this document gives valuable information as to the relations which exist between various apocryphal revelations of the unseen world. He has been able 'to make use of several unpublished documents of an apocryphal nature. These are, the Latin text of the Apocalypse of Paul, and the Apocalypses of the Virgin, of Sedrach, and of Zosimes,' and he expects to give us full texts of these 'at no distant date.'

The two recensions of the Greek text of the *Testament of Abraham* here given are made from nine MSS., all of which are late, the oldest being possibly of the thirteenth century. Two versions, the Roumanian and the Arabic, have also been used, the MSS. of which are still more modern than those of the Greek text.

In his introduction on the history of the

book, Mr. James endeavours, and with much success, to establish the following points as probable: (1) that Origen had seen our *Testament of Abraham*: (2) that in quoting it he has been influenced by something similar in the *Assumption of Moses*; (3) that Origen and Macarius used yet a third book, which also treated of the exodus of souls; (4) that this was the *Apocalypse of Peter*, which (5) is the source of what is common to the *Testament of Abraham* and the *Apocalypse of Paul*. In discussing the second point he re-affirms, what is still sometimes disputed but is far too probable and too widely accepted to be shaken without fresh evidence, that the passage in the Epistle of Jude about the devil contending for the body of Moses comes from the *Assumption of Moses*. Fresh evidence on this point is likely to be discovered, viz. the missing portions of the *Assumption*; and we shall then see whether the dispute between Michael and Satan is contained in the book or not. In discussing the fourth point Mr. James makes certain conjectures as to the character of the *Apocalypse of Peter*; and these conjectures had only just been printed, when the now famous fragments of the *Gospel of Peter* and of the *Apocalypse of Peter* were at last given to the world by French scholars, who found them six years ago, but appear not to have known their value as Christian literature. And it must have been with exceptional satisfaction that Mr. James discovered that his anticipations respecting the nature of the *Apocalypse of Peter* were so largely confirmed by the new fragment. Considering the brevity of the fragment, the amount

of confirmation supplied is very remarkable. To point this out in detail belongs rather to a discussion of the recovered fragment than to a notice of this edition of the *Testament of Abraham*. But it may be mentioned here that the anticipations (1) of a predictive element side by side with the apocalyptic element, and (2) of the latter being largely taken up with the torments of sinners, who (3) are punished in a manner suggested by their sins, are already confirmed. Moreover (4) the conjectured dependence of the second book of the *Sibylline Oracles* and of the *Apocalypse of Paul* upon the *Apocalypse of Peter*, is also established. The remaining point, that whatever is common to the *Apocalypse of Paul* and to the *Testament of Abraham* comes from the *Apocalypse of Peter*, at once becomes highly probable.

What is the probable date of the *Testament of Abraham*? It is likely enough that it belongs to a variety of ages. Two Greek recensions have come down to us; and these are the result of processes of editing, which have not always been very skilful, and have consequently left traces behind them. This repeated editing would not have taken place if the book had not been popular, and it would require a long period for its completion. Mr. James conjectures that the first edition was compiled out of still earlier material in the second century; and that the form in which we now have the book is as late as the ninth or tenth century. As to the place of its composition, 'the mention of the weighing of souls, and partly also the terrific presentment of Death, seem to point to Egypt as its birthplace' (p. 29).

The five pages on the influence of the *Testament* upon later literature are of considerable interest. It is shown that the vision of Thurchill, an Essex labourer, recorded by Matthew Paris (*Chronica Majora*, Rolls Series, II. 497—511), may have been indirectly influenced by the *Testament*. The vision has been greatly elaborated, if not wholly invented, by the monks of S. Alban's Abbey, where some knowledge of Greek apocryphal literature is known to have existed. Some Greek scholar at the Abbey, like John of Basingstoke and Nicolas the Greek who translated the *Testaments of the XII. Patriarchs* into Latin, may have known

enough of the *Testament of Abraham* to supply the material which somewhat resembles it in the vision of Thurchill.

By placing a full analysis of all three documents in parallel columns the editor enables us to obtain a very clear idea of the mutual relations between the two Greek recensions and the Arabic version. Epitomizing will account for a great many of the differences, but by no means for all. Sometimes there is very marked divergence. To take a single example, in the description of a judgment scene. (a) Abel is judge, an angel Dokiel weighs souls, an angel Purnel tests them by fire, and two angels are recorders. A neutral soul is examined and not sentenced. Abraham intercedes for it and for the sinners, and all are saved.—(b) Abel is judge, Enoch is recorder, and two cherubins (*sic*) carry the books of record. The neutral soul is examined and condemned. Abraham destroys the sinners.—(Arabic) God is judge, and Enoch is recorder. The neutral soul is examined and saved. Another soul, proved guilty of great sins, is condemned: but there is no destruction of sinners.

Extracts from the Arabic version, translated by Mr. Barnes from the MS. at Paris, are given in the appendix; and one of them contains material not found in either of the Greek recensions. The appendix also contains extracts from the Arabic version of the *Testament of Isaac* and an abstract of the *Testament of Jacob*. Our knowledge of these two documents is still very scanty, but contributions such as are contained in this instalment of the *Cambridge Texts and Studies* will be gratefully welcomed by the increasing number of students who are interested in this strange branch of ancient literature.

The vigilance of the editors has not succeeded in wholly excluding the 'nauseous' form 'connection' (p. 11) from their work. Except in relation to the Methodists, almost all compositors turn 'connexion' into 'connection,' however clearly one writes the former. Is it too much to expect that at the University Press orders will be given to the staff to do exactly the opposite;—viz. invariably to print 'connexion,' even when the copy gives the incorrect spelling?

ALFRED PLUMMER.

The Etymologies in the Servian Commentary to Vergil, by WILFRED P. MUSTARD. Johns Hopkins Doctor-Dissertation. Reprinted from Colorado College Studies, vol. iii. Colorado Springs, 1892.

MR. MUSTARD'S results must be characterized as rather meagre. Moreover they are in general so obvious as to be of little value. The following are the chief:

1. Servius makes free use of the *lucus a non lucendo* principle. 2. He is fond of deriving Latin words from Greek, e.g. *ars* ἀρσ τῆς ἀρετῆς. 3. In several instances he fails to follow his own principle that a word should agree in its vowel quantities with the word from which it is derived, e.g. *securis* from **senicuris*. 4. He sometimes advocates different etymologies for the same word in different parts of his commentary, e.g. *cadaver* *Aen.* vi. 481 a *cadendo*, but viii. 264 *cadaver dictum quod honore sepulture curat*.

The writer's claim that Servius is further inconsistent in deriving *castor* a *castrando*, and *tus* a *tundendo*, can hardly be allowed, for while Servius does forbid the derivation of Greek words from Latin, yet it is clear that to him *castor* and *tus* were not Greek, but Latin, and he proceeds to explain them accordingly.

Apart from the above general conclusions Mr. Mustard's dissertation is of a mechanical nature. Thus he gives us a list of the different languages from which Servius derives Latin words, a summary of his phonetic resources, aphæresis, synæresis, rhotacism, etc., an enumeration of the different writers whom Servius expressly mentions as his authorities, and lastly a complete list of all those etymologies of Servius 'which according to the highest and most recent authorities are no longer tenable.' This last list constitutes by far the larger part of the entire paper. Naturally most of the etymologies contained in it are of the most fantastic order,—etymologies whose falsity is so obvious to the most casual observer, that it is difficult to understand the object of the compilation. A few of these however challenge comment, and stimulate curiosity as to whom we are to understand by 'the highest and most recent authorities.' Brugmann and Stolz evidently do not belong among them, for Mr. Mustard rejects without discussion the etymology of *ara* for *asa* (Gramm.)—a conclusion from which Umbr. *asa* apparently leaves no escape. Cf. Brugmann, *Grundriss*, i. p. 427. Cf. also the author's rejection of *solvium* for **sod-ium*, from root *sed-*, where Brugmann and Stolz illuminate the change of *d* to *i* by other undoubted examples. Other similar words are *lupercal*, *inferiæ*, *Liber*. Mr. Mustard's list to be useful ought to have included the reasons for his position in case of disputed words. Discussion of moot points cannot properly be waived in scholarly research by a general appeal to authority.

CHAS. E. BENNETT.

Cornell University.

Stories from the Greek Comedians: by the Rev. A. J. CHURCH, with sixteen illustrations after the antique. London, Seely & Co. 1893.

PROBABLY no one knows better than Mr. Church how difficult a task he undertook in preparing a volume of Stories from the Greek Comedians. But a writer who has achieved so much success in his

'Stories' from Homer, the Greek Tragedians, Virgil, Livy, etc., was not unwise in adding another volume to his popular series. The task was not made lighter by including specimens of the New Comedy, in the shape in which it has reached us. But the difficulty is not the same with the New Comedy as with the Old. The Old is somewhat too real, and the New not real enough. Still, for the sake of completeness, Mr. Church is right in giving us samples from Diphilus, Philemon and Menander; as they have filtered through Plautus and Terence: yet we have to remember that it took all the genius of Plautus, with his quips and cranks, his bold jests, and his rich vocabulary, to win the applause of a Roman audience for his renderings from the Greek. And the same audience failed to appreciate the more genuine article, presented in the delicate colouring of Terence. However, Mr. Church has been quite as successful in this part of his book as circumstances allowed: and the 'New Comedy' will, for not a few readers, have an intelligible meaning for the first time.

The case with Aristophanes is different: but the difficulties in the way of the adaptor are not less.

There is a full flavour about the plays which has to be toned down, a grossness of expression has to be pruned, without leaving the plays scentless and flat: there is a 'topical' element in the jests and the situations, which must neither be neglected nor overborne by commentary: there is the political and social purpose, which must be kept in view without being obtruded: and—hardest of all—there is a characteristic subtlety and lightness of touch, and a constant suggestion of true poetry, never obscured in the original by the coarser and commoner surroundings, which must, somehow, be retained even in an epitome, if it is to give a truthful sketch. These difficulties Mr. Church has very fairly faced. His method is to give a short introductory outline of each play, followed by sundry scenes, more or less complete, linked together so as to maintain the thread of the plot, and diversified with metrical renderings of lyrical passages. The volume is quite suitable for young readers; and few of them will fail to enjoy the description of the *fin de siècle* Athenian youth and his old-fashioned father, the 'Paradise of the Birds,' the formal trial of the thievish dog, the contest of Aeschylus and Euripides, and other scenes familiar to scholars. Older readers too may find a new interest in refreshing their memory with the treatment of social problems—ever old, and ever new—which perplexed the Athenian thinker no less than the modern Socialist. Praxagora and Bleepyrus, in the 'Parliament of Women,' (p. 215) fight out the complications of communism most delightfully, and succeed in bringing the question to a solution—or a deadlock, whichever we like to call it. *Prax.* 'The first thing in my plan is that all should share and share alike....I shall make all land common property, and the money. Every man will have whatever he wants for the asking...No one will steal then. He would be stealing his own property. And if a man should say "Your coat or your life!" you'll only have to give it him, and go to the public store and get another.' This—if we subtract the humour—is not unworthy of Trafalgar Square (on Saturdays, Sundays, and Bank Holidays)! Mr. Church would have added to the interest of his illustrations, if he had given some better account of them than the mere title 'from the antique.' It may mean so much, or so little.

W. W. MERRY.

IN his instructive and—may I add?—most kindly notice of my *Notes on the Nic. Ethics* in the March No. of the *Classical Review*, Mr. Herbert Richards dissents from my view of the relation of 'justice in exchange' to 'distributive justice' in Book v. If I am wrong—and I readily admit that I may be wrong, for an objection coming from Mr. Richards comes with weight—my error is a very ancient one. It originates with the writer of M. M. who, in i. 33, 1193 b 36—1194 a 25—a passage to which I refer, vol. i. p. 433—treats 'justice in exchange' as a case of 'distributive justice.' It will be observed that, though the writer does not use the expression 'distributive justice,'¹ he starts with the subject of *E. N.* v. 3 (the chapter on 'distributive justice') in his mind, and, after saying that returns are in proportion to labour, immediately goes on to instance *exchanges* in which labourers get the returns of their labour—ἐπεὶ οὖν ἐστὶ τὸ δίκαιον ἴσον, καὶ τὸ τῷ ἀνάλογον ἴσον δίκαιον ἂν εἴη. τὸ δ' ἀνάλογον ἐν τέτταρσι γίνεται ἐλαχίστοις· ὥς γὰρ τὸ Α πρὸς τὸ Β, τὸ Γ πρὸς τὸ Δ. οἷον ἀνάλογόν ἐστι τὸν τὰ πολλὰ κεκτημένον πολλὰ εἰσφέρειν, τὸν δὲ τὰ ὀλίγα κεκτημένον ὀλίγα· πάλιν ὁμοίως τὸν μὲν πολλὰ πεπονηκότα πολλὰ λαμβάνειν, τὸν δὲ ὀλίγα πεπονηκότα ὀλίγα λαμβάνειν. ὥς δὲ ἔχει ὁ πεπονηκὼς πρὸς τὸν μὴ πεπονηκότα, οὕτω τὰ πολλὰ πρὸς τὰ ὀλίγα. ὥς δὲ ὁ πεπονηκὼς πρὸς τὰ πολλὰ, οὕτως ὁ μὴ πεπονηκὼς πρὸς τὰ ὀλίγα.

¹ Nor does he use the expression 'corrective justice.'

ἔοικεν δὲ καὶ Πλάτων τῇ ἀναλογίᾳ ταύτῃ τοῦ δίκαιον χρῆσθαι ἐν τῇ πολιτείᾳ· ὁ μὲν γὰρ γεωργός, φησὶ, σίτον ποιεῖ, ὁ δ' οἰκοδόμος οἰκίαν, ὁ δὲ ὑφάντης ἱμάτιον, ὁ δὲ σκυντοτόμος ὑπόδημα. ὁ μὲν οὖν γεωργὸς τῷ οἰκοδόμῳ σίτον δίδωσιν, ὁ δ' οἰκοδόμος τῷ γεωργῷ οἰκίαν ὁμοίως δὲ οἱ ἄλλοι πάντες οὕτως ἔχουσιν ὥστε τὰ παρ' αὐτοῖς ἀντικαταλλάττεσθαι τῶν παρὰ τοῖς ἄλλοις—then follow remarks, down to 1194 a 25, parallel to *E. N.* v. 5 (chapter on τὸ ἀντιπεπονητός) §§ 6—16, but differing from these sections in not using the term ἀντιπεπονητός, which does not occur till the subject of retribution in criminal cases is begun 1194 a 29.

J. A. STEWART.

MR. SKENE writes to complain that his views are not fairly represented in the notice of his book which appeared in our last number. The only point in which we think he has any ground for complaint is in the misquotation which occurs twice over in p. 129 a, where he is made to say 'no word in Archaean Greek expressed "wet," nor is any idea traced from it, unless it were composed of this monosyllable' (ἡβδ); the words actually used by him in p. 7 of his book being 'no word in Archaean Greek expressed "wet," or any idea traced from it' &c. We regret the misquotation, but we cannot see that it in any way affects the argument.

Ed.

ARCHAEOLOGY.

TWO BOOKS ON GREEK ANTIQUITIES IN RUSSIA.

1. *Bibliothèque des Monuments Figurés Grecs et Romains*, vol. iii.: *Antiquités du Bosphore Cimmérien*, rééditées par SALOMON REINACH: large 8vo. Paris: Firmin Didot et Cie. 1892. (213 pages text, 2 maps, 5 plans, 86 plates.)
2. *Antiquités de la Russie Méridionale*, par Prof. N. KONDAKOF, COMTE J. TOLSTOI, et SALOMON REINACH. 4to. Paris. Leroux. 1891—1892. (555 pages, 477 illustrations in the text.)

THE series of reproductions of scarce and expensive folios, which M. Reinach had the boldness to project and the energy to carry

out, has now reached the third volume¹; and this volume is even more useful than either of its predecessors, for the original edition of the *Antiquités du Bosphore Cimmérien* was more than rare, it was practically un-purchasable. M. Reinach mentions that only 200 copies of the original work were produced, and that it was never sent into the market. Many of these have passed into the great libraries; and only in extraordinary and exceptional cases can a copy now be obtained. There are six copies known to him in Paris, four in the great libraries, and two in the possession of private individuals; I do not gather clearly from his words whether the copy which he

¹ For vol. i. see *Classical Review*, 1889, p. 83; for vol. ii. 1891, p. 131.

obtained at the cost of so much time and trouble is ranked among the six, or is to be added to them. It would be interesting to know how many copies there are in England of this work, which from the great merit of the plates, and still more from the importance and value of many of the works of art reproduced in the plates, is of the very highest value for admirers and students of Greek art, and also for archaeologists in general.

The same method has been followed in the text of M. Reinach's volume as in that of the two which preceded it; his aim is to give his readers in brief and clear terms the gist of all that has stood the test of time in the rather diffuse and wordy original text, and he has added all that his own wide erudition, aided by the amplest command of books, could supply towards completing the history and explanation of the subjects discussed in the text and the objects represented in the plates. Those who have followed M. Reinach's voluminous works as closely and attentively as I have done, will appreciate the accuracy that characterizes them; those who have looked into almost any of them will appreciate the width of his reading. It is not possible for me in Aberdeen to compare the new volume with the original work. I have to depend in this review entirely on the very careful and minute study which I made of the *Antiquités* and of the whole series of the *Comptes Rendus* in preparing a set of lectures on the 'Greek Colonies' given in Oxford in the first term after I returned from residing in Asia Minor, 1880—1884. The lectures advertised under that title were afterwards, from the abundance of material, restricted to the colonies in South Russia. It is necessary to mention this in order to show that I have some justification in presuming to criticize and to recommend the books now under review.

M. Reinach has added an index of eleven pages to his text, a brief summary of the *Comptes Rendus de la Commission Impériale* 1859—1881, and a great index of fifty-five pages to the vast Supplements attached by Stephani to the *Comptes*. One can only regret that the original intention of reproducing the plates of the *Comptes Rendus* as one of the succeeding volumes of the series has had to be abandoned. This index will be of use to those who have access to the *Comptes Rendus*, which are, in England at least, as rare as the *Antiquités du Bosphore*. The loss of the volume we had hoped for is compensated in part, but only in part, by the

second book which I have to notice. This is a French translation of a work published originally in Russian by Prof. Kondakof and Count J. Tolstoi: M. Reinach has revised the translation, and made considerable alterations in detail, both for the sake of clearness and elegance, and also in the interest of accuracy and scientific tone. It is due to his influence that the destruction of the Museum at Kertch by the allied armies of England and Turkey in 1855 is alluded to in studiously moderate terms. This disgraceful act of Vandalism, perpetrated in fact by a few Turks alone (as I have seen it elsewhere asserted), was, I believe, characterized in much stronger language in the Russian edition.

The *Antiquités de la Russie Méridionale* contains a popular and brief account of a very wide subject. Parts I. and II. give the more striking discoveries described in the two great Russian works which we have mentioned, and in some others, besides a clear and well-selected account of the countries and the ancient peoples who inhabited them. Everything that is in it deserves praise; and there is much in it that hitherto has been inaccessible to all but the favoured few. But, in a work that aims at being popular, we are struck with the neglect of every device for attaining clearness and intelligibility: the book is, not merely in contents, but in arrangement, far more difficult and above the populace than corresponding works are in England. There is no division into chapters, no descriptive head-lines at the top or in the margin of the pages; nothing but a continuous, unbroken text with interspersed illustrations, and indexes at the end. Much might have been done by better arrangement to make the text more handy and practically useful.

Part III., though lying almost beyond the scope of the *Classical Review*, is in some respects the most interesting and important of the three. It deals with the non-hellenic art of Southern Asiatic Russia; great part of it is quite novel to me, and I cannot say more than that I find it of extraordinary fascination. Not even Afghanistan and India afford more striking proof of the widespread effects of Graeco-Roman civilization than the excavations and discoveries here described. The terra-cottas excavated in 1887—8 at Afrosiab beside Samarcand are especially interesting, showing the Greek types adapted to Asiatic subjects and ideas. Afrosiab is the name given to a mound, about five kilometres in circum-

ference, which is either a great Graeco-Asiatic necropolis, or a huge *kitchen-midden* and place of discharge for the useless and broken objects of a great city of olden time. The form Afrasiab, which is common, is not accepted by the authors.

The combination of a high standard in the illustrations with a low standard in the price (30 francs and 25 francs) is quite wonderful in comparison with English books. The original plates of the *Antiquités du Bosphore* are photographically reproduced, which however has entailed a loss of distinctness in outline in the case of several of the coloured plates. The two maps, being reduced in size, have to be studied with a magnifying glass. But, in spite of some inevitable disadvantages, the two books make generally accessible a subject which is of the first importance and interest to many circles of scholars and students of history, and which previously was practically unknowable to the great majority of educated people.

W. M. RAMSAY.

Excursions in Greece to Recently Explored Sites of Classical Interest: Mycenae, Tiryns, Dodona, Delos, Athens, Olympia, Eleusis, Epidaurus, Tanagra. By CHARLES DIEHL, translated by EMMA R. PERKINS, with an introduction by REGINALD STUART POOLE, LL.D. With nine plans and forty-one illustrations. London: H. Grevel & Co. 1893.

MR. DIEHL's pleasantly written book traverses much the same ground recently occupied in more scholarly and deliberate fashion by Professor Gardner in his *New Chapters in Greek History*. It appeals however to a much wider public, assuming no knowledge and offering no serious discussion of debateable archaeological problems. Detailed notice would therefore here be out of place, and it may be sufficient to say that the successive chapters are bright and readable in the accustomed popular French manner. They are arranged in roughly chronological order and gathered into historical unity by Professor Poole's pleasant and sympathetic preface.

As the book however is sure to benefit a wide public we feel bound to notice two serious defects, mainly in the hope that they will be remedied in a second edition sure to be shortly called for. The plans, of which there is a liberal supply, are thoroughly inadequate and unsatisfactory; the transla-

tor is too well furnished an archaeologist not to have regretted what she probably could not prevent. The source of these plans is not given; certainly they are not taken from the official *Πρακτικά* of the Athenian Archaeological Society or from any other reliable source. There are few keener joys than to follow out a good ground-plan on the spot, but if any one takes the plan of the Acropolis, p. 96, and tries to work it through on the spot they will assuredly wish it—at home. The plan of the very Parthenon itself is a disgrace. Whoever drew the plan has never made up his mind whether he will indicate columns by a consecutive black line or by dots; the colonnade of the opisthodomos is drawn as a thick black line joined solidly to the front antae; that of the pronaos, precisely identical in structure, by a thick line and a row of dots; the basis of the chryselephantine statue is grossly inaccurate as to size. The plan of the old Athene temple is even worse; the colonnade of the pronaos is wholly missing; the ground-plan of the Propylaea defies description. The same must be said of the plan of Olympia on p. 229, where the wall of the old Roman altis is given as the original altis wall and the smaller original precinct seems to be regarded as a mere terrace. We sincerely pity any traveller who tries to understand the complex structures of the Theokoleon and the Leonidaion from the ground-plans here given; from the plan of the Zeus temple we are driven to the conclusion that M. Diehl neither knows nor cares where the great statue of Zeus stood, and, still worse, that he has yet to learn that antae had any architectural significance.

A second, though less serious, defect which must be charged to the translator is a general looseness and vagueness of reference. We have (p. 210) statements like the following: 'for pediments, Six in *Journ. Hell. Studies*,' where the student is turned loose on a periodical that dates from 1880. The plates are unnumbered and carelessly named. No one would gather from the titles that the objects depicted on pp. 261, 285, 286 are one and all in the Olympia Museum. On p. 116 a familiar grave relief is entitled the *Stele of Ariston*; it is referred to in the text as 'the beautiful painted bas-relief known as the "Soldier of Marathon." On the same page it is said of the Moschophoros that 'the inscription recently discovered on its base' etc. which gives obviously a false impression. Generally we would ask for

a sharp revision of details in what is otherwise a most useful book.

JANE E. HARRISON.

Coptic Manuscripts brought from the Fayyum
by W. M. Flinders Petrie, Esq. D.C.L.
Edited with commentaries and indices by
W. E. CRUM, M.A. Four Collotype
plates. London, D. Nutt. 1893. pp. viii,
92.

MR. CRUM has edited the Coptic papyri from the Fayyûm discovered by Mr. Flinders Petrie, as well as the papyrus in the Bodleian Library. The documents are biblical, patristic, and liturgical, with a very large number of letters; the whole being more or less fragmentary. The value of this work lies in the extreme care taken by the editor, and in the discrimination of five dialects instead of the three with which we were hitherto familiar. These are Boheiric, Middle Egyptian, divided into Memphitic and Fayyumic, Sahidic, and Achmimic. This mere nomenclature shows that the study of Coptic in the hands of scholars like Mr. Crum, Dr. Stern and others is taking a new departure. The contents of the papyri throw very little fresh light upon contemporary history, but more upon social life; their chief value however is linguistic.

R. S. P.

TWO EPIDAUROIAN CURES BY ASCLEPIUS.

In the inscriptions found at Epidaurus, there are several instances of patients being cured by snakes (*Ephemeris Arch.* 1883, p. 215 l. 115; *id.* 1885, p. 22, l. 117, 130). Similarly Plutus was cured of his blindness by the licking of the tongue of the sacred snakes which lived in the temple of Asclepius (*Arist. Pl.* 730—740). They were regarded with veneration and were fed by the worshippers (*Paus.* ii. 11, 8) and were thought to be the embodiment of the god (*Paus.* ii. 10; *Aurelius Victor de viris illustribus* xxii. 1; *Valerius Maximus* i. 8, 2 etc.). This idea is so prevalent both in the folk-lore of other countries, and in Greece, that I venture to point out what I believe to be two more instances of the same in the second large Epidaurian inscription, though the very imperfect state of the text prevents us arriving at absolute certainty.

(i.) *Eph. Arch.* 1885, p. 18, l. 69.

1. [Θ] ἐρσανδρος ἀλίκος φθισικός
οὗτος ἐγκαθέδων δ' ἔψιν εἶδε

2. [ἐ]ώρη ἐφ' ἁμάξας εἰς αλιεῖς
3. [τ]ῶν ἱερῶν ἐπὶ οσησοπολ
4. γμένος περ[ὶ τ]ὸ λουτωνδ
5. ι τοῦ Θερσ[ά]νδρον οἱ ο δρ
6. ος καταβ[ὰς τ]ὸν Θέρ[σανδρον].

Starting with the possibility of a snake cure—there are two others in the same inscription—there is strong reason to suppose we have another here.

L. 3 τῶν ἱερῶν. In these inscriptions this phrase almost always refers to the sacred animals, the dog or the snake.

[Cf. *Eph. Arch.* 1883, p. 215, l. 125.

Οὗτος ὑπαρ ὑπὸ κυνὸς τῶν κατὰ τὸ ἱερὸν
θ[εραπ]ευόμενος τοὺς ὀπτιλλοὺς ὑ[γυ]ήs ἀπῆλθε.

Again *id.* 1885, p. 16, l. 37

κῦ[ω]ν τῶν ἱερῶν ὑ[παρ τ]ῇ γλώσσῃ ἰθερά-
πνευσε.]

L. 5 οἱ ὁ δρ

I read οἱ ὁ δρ[άκων]. That a sacred animal is mentioned is probable from τῶν ἱερῶν.

L. 4 γμένος. I propose ἐλλήγ-
μένος, a word suited to the action of a snake.

L. 2 ἐφ' ἁμάξας. Why should a δράκων be connected with an ἁμάξα? Cf. *Paus.* ii. 10:

φασὶ δὲ σφίσιν ἐξ Ἐπιδαύρου κομισθῆναι τὸν θεὸν (Ἀσκληπίον) ἐπὶ ζεύγους ἡμίονων δράκοντι εἰκασμένον.

The story was very likely well known, and may have suggested the dream to the patient: at any rate it does away with the absurdity of the idea.

(ii.) *Eph. Arch.* 1885, p. 19, l. 102.

1. Κλεῖ μὲν ἡς ἀργεῖος ἀκρατῆς...
2. τον ἐνεκάθευδε καὶ ὄψιν εἶδε[.....]
3. ριελίξαι περὶ τὸ σῶμα καὶ μια[.....]
4. νὶν ἐπὶ τινὰ λίμναν ἄς τὸ ὕδωρ

(2) ριελίξαι... I propose to read

εἶδε[ε · ἐδόκει δράκων αὐτὸν περ]ιελίξαι.

Now in a very large class of stories, the snake has in his keeping the water of healing. (*Ralston, Russian Folk Lore*, pp. 233—235). Similarly the snake in this instance takes [ἀγειν] νὶν the patient to a lake ἄς τὸ ὕδωρ [ἰάσμιον] etc.

This notion of the snake with the water of life is one of the most widely spread superstitions: sometimes it has possession of a herb which heals and raises the dead (*Apollodorus* iii. 3, 1, *Grimm, Kinder und*

Hausmärchen, No. 16, Prym und Socin, *Syrische Sagen und Märchen*, No. 33, p. 121 etc.); and this taking of the patient to a lake, coupled with our certain knowledge of Asclepius as a snake, makes this interpretation probable.

E. F. BENSON.

NOTE ON THE CONDITION OF THE COLOSSI OF MONTE CAVALLO DURING THE MIDDLE AGES.

DURING the summer of 1892, while on a short visit in London, I was able to examine the plates (112 and 113) in the *Speculum Romanae Magnificentiae*, which represent the colossal statues on the Quirinal at Rome before their restoration. So far as I know, those who have written on the position of these statues during the Middle Ages, and before their restoration in 1589 by Pope Sixtus V., have regarded it as certain that the two statues stood on a common base a little to the east of their present position. This is the view of Duhn (*Matz-Duhn, Ant. Bildw. in Rom* I. 959) and Loewy (*Inscr. Griech. Bildh.* 494), and it seems to have remained unquestioned. It is based on the testimony of the old plans of Rome, and of these two plates, which apparently served as models for the reproductions of these figures in the various collections of antique sculpture published during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, when the artist did not care to represent the statues in their restored condition. As to the evidence of the plans there can be no question; all show the statues on a large oblong base, but owing to the scale on which they are drawn, and the lack of accuracy in details, their testimony is not of great weight, especially as they regularly represent the group as perfect, though it is certain that this was not the case shortly before the restoration of 1589. The plates however seem to tell a different story as to the condition of the figures during the Middle Ages, and to make it at least probable that the common base for both groups never existed. Plate 112 is a front view of the statues taken from the left, and unfortunately shows only the upper part of the bases. This however represents clearly the stone pedestals, crowned with an 'egg and dart' moulding, under each statue, and between them a wall of brick, rising higher than the stonework, and pierced by a door and window. Plate 113 is a rear view, and here again the stone pedestals are carefully distinguished from

the brick wall between them, which is clearly shown to have a much less depth. This evidence seems to lead naturally to the conclusion that the statues were originally placed on separate and parallel bases, possibly on either side of the entrance to the Temple of the Sun, or the *Thermae* of Constantine, and that the height and convenient distance of these bases was utilized during the Middle Ages for the construction of a house between them. That a certain pride was even then felt in the statues seems plain from the almost perfect preservation of the human figures, and the rude attempt at repairing the horse of the group to the left, by building a lofty column of brick to support the head after the destruction of the fore-quarters. This building was evidently abandoned, and had fallen into ruin at the time the plates were drawn, for not only are the brick walls represented as uneven, but grass and weeds are growing luxuriantly along their tops, and from numerous cracks and gaps in the pedestals. These walls, though drawn as brick, and doubtless composed chiefly of that material, may well have been the source of the architectural fragments which Flaminio Vacca says were found in the bases of the statues at the time of their removal in 1589; at least it seems no longer necessary to infer from the presence of these fragments that the pedestals, and consequently the erection of the statues on the Quirinal, are a work of the time of Constantine. It is noticeable that Vacca, who was present at the removal of the statues, always uses the plural in speaking of the destruction of the pedestals [*Leipz. Berichte* 1881, p. 59, 10].

JAMES M. PATON.

Athens, Greece.

M. SALOMON REINACH has favoured us with the following communication; 'Referring to Mr. Warde Fowler's note in *Class. Rev.* 1893, p. 108, I beg permission to state that I have recently written about the Berlin basalt bust in the *Gazette des beaux Arts*, 1892, i. p. 475, where I published a basalt bust belonging to the Vienna Museum of much the same technique as the Pseudo-Caesar in Berlin. I consider the latter as perfectly genuine, but as having nothing whatever to do with Caesar. It is the portrait of some Egyptian in Roman times. Having examined it at length in Berlin, I feel absolutely certain that it cannot be a forgery.'

THE ORCHESTRA AND THE STAGE.

MR. ERNEST GARDNER has forwarded to us a translation of the paper on this subject which Prof. Ernst Curtius read before the Archaeological Society in Berlin. The paper has already appeared in full

in the *Berl. Phil. Woch.* 1893, pp. 97—100 and p. 125, and it is therefore unnecessary to reprint it in its entirety; but it may be of interest here to give an abstract of the writer's views.

Prof. Curtius is disinclined to accept as yet the new theories of Dörpfeld, which some consider to have settled the question definitely. It has been stated that in the early days the one actor stood on a *πρόπυρα*; but that, with the introduction of a second actor, both were made to stand in the orchestra, and, that they might be more conspicuous, wore buskins with high soles. But why should not the table have been enlarged? It was more appropriate for a performer, whether of music or acting, to mount on a bema: moreover, it is unlikely that the Greeks, with their precision of ideas as to limitation (*ὀρίσειν*), would have suffered encroachment on the solemnly dedicated space allotted to the cyclic dances of the chorus of fifty. The drama had originally nothing to do with the Dionysiac dances; Solon protested vehemently against the innovation when Thespis introduced his masked play. If any one had attempted to cut off a segment of the sacred circle for the use of the actors, they would have been met with a cry of 'nolite turbare circulos nostros.'

The writer sees no reason for supposing that the actors descended to the lower level. The fact, that no foundations of a permanent stage earlier than Lycurgus have been found, proves nothing; since we have always supposed that a temporary wooden stage was erected for each successive festival. We have a well-known example of this wooden scaffolding in Plato's *Symposium* p. 194 A-B. Agathon's friends say to him 'that he should feel no embarrassment in their small circle, he who had just mounted the stage (*ἀναβαίνοντος ἐπὶ τὸν ὀκρίβαντα*) so boldly and unabashed, and exhibited himself with his actors before so large a number of spectators.' Here the *τοσοῦτον θέατρον* can only mean the Dionysiac theatre, where the poet was brought face to face with the assembled people: this is clear from the reference, which immediately precedes this passage, to an audience of 30,000 Hellenes who flocked together there.

Besides, the very idea of the two levels is a distinct artistic gain, in the contrast it affords of two spheres of life, one raised above the other, yet in vivid correlation with each other. The temporary character of the erection was adapted to the needs of the Attic drama, which, as it grew, was ever developing fresh structural necessities; but after the creative energy of the Attic drama was spent, it may well be that the idea arose of constructing solid buildings for the representations. This happened, as Wieseler (*Theatergebäude*) admitted, in the fourth century. At the time of Lycurgus, the literary side of the drama was its more important aspect, and playgoers were content with a more conventional staging. The cyclic dances in the orchestra lost their importance, and the site of the new stage buildings was advanced nearer to the foot of the hill, so that a part of the old orchestra was cut off; the earlier wooden scaffolds only touched the circle as tangents. The semicircle by the Akropolis is, judging from its position, a work of ancient date. It was the first work in the spirit of the old democracy, entirely in harmony with the era of Themistokles, intended to provide dignified accommodation for the assembled citizens, and to unite them in common festivities.

That such a theatre might be altogether independent of dramatic performances we see from the case of Sparta; and at Athens the auditorium may at first have been associated with the cyclic dances at

the place of sacrifice. There is no need to question the tradition, that the Athenian theatre was constructed in consequence of the collapse of the highest seats in 500 B.C.; it is at any rate certain that the lower part of the slope of the Akropolis was used before the time of the Persian Wars to hold seats for spectators (Baumeister, *Denkm.* p. 1736). We have always held that the theatre at Athens was the model of perfection of ancient theatre-building; and we cannot believe that the Romans, dependent as they were on Greek ideas, could have been the first inventors of the stage.

It is true that the word *λογεῖον* does not occur until comparatively late; but this is accidental. The *ὀκρίβας* in Plato is essentially the *λογεῖον*: cp. *Lexicon of Timaeus* πῆγμα τὸ ἐν τῷ θεάτρῳ τιθέμενον, ἐφ' οὗ ἴστανται οἱ τὰ δημόσια λέγοντες: and the trimeter treated by Rhode

λογεῖον ἐστὶ πῆξις ἐστορεσμένη
ξύλων

[εἶτα ἐξῆς]
ὀκρίβας δ' ὀνομάζεται—

where *ὀκρίβας* is expressly made equivalent to *λογεῖον*. Moreover, other words, such as *σκηνή*, *προσκήνιον* serve as synonyms of *λογεῖον*.

The tradition followed by Vitruvius is not connected with the development of the Greek theatre. He regards the orchestra as old material, which is cut about for other purposes, and the fixity of his figures, such as the twelve feet high stage, shows how pedantically everything with him is stereotyped. But the ancient grammarians, who drew their information from Greek authorities, contain a more genuine tradition; expressions so simple and decisive as *σκηνή μὲν ὑποκριτῶν ἵδιον, ἡ δὲ ὀρχήστρα τοῦ χοροῦ* bear the stamp of indisputable truth.

Revue Archéologique. March—April, 1892. Paris.

1. Deloche continues his papers on seals and signet rings of the Merovingian period: several cuts. 2. Cumont; Silvanus in the cult of Mithras: the name of this god was often applied to strange divinities which had been assimilated to him by some chance relation: publishes (pl. x.) two bronzes of the Louvre showing that Silvanus was adopted into the Mithraic religion; and a cut of a relief in the Vatican, representing Silvanus Pantheos. 3. Bapst; concludes his study (*ante*, 1891) of the Mysteries of the Middle Ages; (viii.) decorative painting and painters of the *mise en scène*; (ix.) profane pieces and the guilds; (x.) end of the mysteries. 4. Carton; publishes a three-sided Latin inscription which he found near the ancient Uci Majus; it refers to a law of Hadrian *de rudibus agris*, commented on by the procurators and applied to the administration of the *salvus* of the country: it dates from the simultaneous reign of Sept. Severus and his sons: three cuts and map. 5. Mauss; the church of S. Jeremiah at Abou Gosch recently acquired by the French Government and to be restored by them is probably identifiable with the Emmaüs of S. Luke and the Castellum of Vespasian; with a study on the stadium at the time of Luke and Josephus: twenty-five cuts; observations on Anathoth (the birthplace of Jeremiah) and Abou Gosch.

Bulletin mensuel de l'Académie des Inscr. Société Nat. des Ant. Note by Bréal on the epitaph of a poet (*Notizie*, 1891, p. 34) Bibliography. Cagnat's revue des publications épigraphiques.

C. S.

The same. May—June, 1892.

1. Waille; note on a matrix for an ancient medallion, found at Cherchel: it represents a satyr surprising a sleeping bacchante but himself surprised by a youth, whose identity is uncertain: plate. 2. Lebègue; discovery of antiquities at Cazères (Haute Garonne): lamps, an inscription, and sculpture. 3. Lafaye; publishes the mosaic found at Saint-Romain-en-Gal (Rhône), recently acquired by the Louvre; it consisted originally of a floral border enclosing forty squares in rows of four, each square measuring 0.59 m.: twenty-seven are preserved, and contain figures or groups representing allegorically the Seasons, and scenes appropriate to them: it dates from the early years of the third century and throws considerable light on the different agricultural processes of that period: cuts of the whole and of most of the separate squares. 5. Durand-Gréville; on the colour of the decoration on Greek vases (second article): thinks that the 'yellow' colour on vases is really due not to the desire of the artist but to over-oxidization of the original black colour in course of time; and that it naturally shows its effects more on the lines where the artist purposely drew in a thinner black; quoting the analogy of the ink in certain old MSS. 6. Omont; republishes a Greek letter on papyrus which originally came to light among the archives of the abbey of S. Denys about 1690: it is part of the letter of an Emperor of Byzantium, possibly to a king of France; proposes to refer it to the first half of the ninth cent.: two phototype plates. 7. Cagnat; correction of his note on the military diploma of Cherchel (*ante*, p. 296).

S. Reinach's *Chronique d'Orient* (pp. 395-435). Bulletin Mensuel. Société Nat. des Ant. Note by du Chatellier on a discovery at Plélan. Reviews on Goodyear's *Lotus*, (G. Foucart); and a note of Krall's brochure 'Die etrusk. Mumienbinden des Agramer Museums' (G. P.). C. S.

The same. July—August, 1892.

1. Deloche; signet rings and seals of the Merovingian period, continued. 2. Le Blant; St. Augustine speaks of the priest of Pileatus as declaring that that god was a Christian; Pileatus is here one of the fratres pileati, the Dioscuri, who are frequently represented with a star on their head; this star is often cruciform, and this was taken as indicating the Christian character of the Dioscuri: five cuts. 3. de Jubainville; compares the Celtic and Greek forms of oath. 6. Maréjol; publishes a discovery of antiquities at Redressan (Gard) of the 2nd cent. A.D.; including a sepulchral stele inscribed ΚΡΕΙΤΕ. 7. Jannery; according to a wide-spread theory, the origin of our signs of notation and of Greek musical notation is due to the Pythagoreans; discusses the actual 'mystograms'; and decides in favour of an Indo-Arabian origin. 8. Inventory of the Visconti collection at the Bibl. Nat., concluded (*cf. ante*, vol. xvii.). 9. Mauss; the church of S. Jeremiah at Abou Gosch, continued; further researches into the ancient measures of length. Bulletin of the Acad. de Inscr. and of the Soc. Nat.

des Ant., News &c. Bibliography (review of Paris 'Élatée'). Cagnat's Epigraphical review. C. S.

The same. September—October, 1892.

1. Deloche; Merovingian signet rings, &c., continued. 2. Havet; in eighteen localities in France the word Igoranda or Icoranda is found, which must mean 'frontier,' and must have marked at some period Gaulish or Roman the limit of territory between the two nations. 3. Male; concludes his study of the Romanesque capitals of the Toulouse museum and the Toulousian school of the twelfth cent.: three plates; suggests that a Corpus should be compiled of all similar capitals. 4. Gaidoz; in several inscriptions we have the name of a goddess Aero-Cura, who is connected with Dispatier; the name is a Latinized form of *Hpa kupia and naturally acquired the meaning of 'she who is occupied with money'; with the invasion of Greek myths into Latin ideas, ΠΑΟΥΡΑΥ misinterpreted became Dispatier. 5. Carton; publishes the inscription from the temple of the Capitol at Numulius. 6. Doublet; describes the fine mosaic found at Hadrumetum, now unfortunately for the most part destroyed; it represents negro pygmies in scenes of hunting and fishing, and was obviously executed under strong Egyptian influence: plate. 7. Mauss; continues his researches into ancient measures of length, in connection with the church at Abou Gosch. Bulletin of the Acad. des Inscr. News, &c. (letter of M. Berthelot on the changes undergone by the colour on ancient objects). Bibliography (Reviews of the Berlin Beschreibung des ant. Sculp.; of Collignon's History of Sculpture; Dumont's Mélanges; and Weber's Guide du voyageur à Ephèse). C. S.

The same. November—December, 1892.

1. Longnon; criticises M. Havet's paper (*ante*, p. 170); prefers the form Ewiranda, which occurs in a chart of 938; the termination -randa is the part that signifies limit, &c. 2. Weber; publishes two bas-reliefs of Laodiceia and Tripolis, now at Smyrna: plate. 3. de Laigue; some tombs were discovered at Cadiz in 1891, which contained amongst other things some jewels; these are certainly Egyptian, and are such as are found wherever the Phœnician or Carthaginian mariners touched in antiquity: four cuts. 4. Amélineau; the head of the Nile delta has shifted in the course of ages; in the time of Herodotus it was at Cercasora, of Diocletian at Schatanouf, and now it is still lower. The veracity of Herodotus is still further confirmed by the identification of the town of Bonto. 5. Cumont; summary catalogue of figured monuments relating to the cult of Mithras. 6. Toulouse; describes antiquities found in Paris in 1891 at the angle formed by the Malebranche and Le Goff roads: pottery, lamps, &c., with axes of the stone age, and Gaulish coins: various cuts. Notices of Ernest Renan (S. Reinach, Deschamps, and Berger). Bulletin of the Acad. des Inscr. Bibliography (Reviews, Gsell's Vulci, de Lessert's Vicaires et Comtes d'Afrique). Cagnat's Epigraphical review. C. S.

SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS.

American Journal of Philology. Whole No. 51. Oct. 1892.

On *Delbrück's Fædic Syntax*, W. D. Whitney. *The Song of Songs*, Russell Martineau. *Verbals in -ros in Sophocles ii.*, C. E. Bishop. This paper treats of (1) the neuter force of the Verbal, (2) the instrumental use of the verbalia, (3) the transitive form of the Verbals. *Ovidiana*, Robinson Ellis. The following passages are discussed, *A. A. ii.* 305—8, *Rem. Am.* 699, 700, *Epist. Sapph.* 51—56 and 63—66, *Amor.* iii. 8. 65, 66. There is a long review of the 3rd edition of Jowett's *Plato* by Paul Shorey: 'a philosopher is required to translate a philosopher, and Prof. Jowett's belletristic attitude towards philosophy impairs the value of his translation for serious students.' Briefly mentioned are the *Flinders Petrie Papyri* 'which Mr. Mahaffy has edited with his wonted jauntiness,' and Bury's *Isthmian Odes of Pindar* on the same lines as his *Nemeans*, 'the most simple matters are stated with the air of one who sees a new planet swim into his ken, and the notes are loaded with statistics that are absolutely lacking in point.'

Whole No. 52. Dec. 1892.

The Limitation of the Imperative in the Attic Orators, C. W. E. Müller. An elaborate statistical paper, divided (1) as to *number and kind*, (2) as to *form*, (3) as to *position*. The writer criticizes Delbrück's view of the origin of the imperative use of the aor. subj. with *μή*. *Miscellanea Graeca*, F. Haussen: (1) *De Artemidis veriloquio*, (2) *De Helenae veriloquio*, (3) *De Hellas veriloquio*, (4) *De Agamemnonis patria*, (5) *De Achivis et Hellenibus Homeris. Verbals in -ros in Sophocles iii.*, C. E. Bishop. The concluding paper, which consists of etymological and critical remarks. *Studies in Etymology*, E. W. Fay. On the Europeo-Armenian treatment of *tr* 2; *splendidus* and its congeners, with an explanation of *vrddhi* in Sanscrit; *πέρω* and *perdo*; *vibro*; *vincio* and *necto*; *vivo*: *vic-si*, *vic-tus*. In *Soph. Ant.* 1204 sq. M. L. Earle suggests *κεῖθος* or *γύαλον* for *κοῖλον*. Benfey's *Kleinere Schriften*, parts iii. and iv. edited by A. Bezzenberger, are reviewed by Hermann Collitz. *The Iphigenia at Aulis* of E. B. England by J.R. Wheeler. 'A noteworthy contribution to the literature of Euripides. The editor regards the play as more or less patchwork.' *Syntaxis Aristophaneae capita selecta* of S. Sobolewski by B. L. Gildersleeve, a treatise on the conditional, temporal and relative sentences in Aristophanes which no student of Greek Syntax can read without interest and profit. Briefly mentioned are Wilamowitz-Moellendorf's translation of *Eur. Hipp.* and Grant Allen's of the *Attis* of Catullus.

Theologische Quartalschrift. 74 Jahrgang. Tübingen. 1892.

Heft I. Zisterer, *Die Apostelgräber nach Gajus* discusses the passage in Eusebius (H.E. ii. 25, ed. Heinichen) relating to the graves of the Apostles, who had founded the Church at Rome. He maintains that the term *τρόπαια*, which occurs there twice, is synonymous with the expressions *κοιμητήρια* and *τοκοῖ* *ἐνθα τῶν εἰρημνῶν ἀποστόλων τὰ ἱερὰ σκηνώματα κατατίθενται* which precede it, as well as with *τῶν σκηνημάτων αὐτῶν* (Παύλου καὶ Πέτρου) *καταθέντες ὁ χώρος* which follows (H.E. iii. 31). Hesy-

chius explains *τρόπαια* as *νικητήρια*, *σύμβολα νίκης*; according to Stephanus (Thesaurus graecae linguae, vii. 2494) *τρόπαιον* dicitur monumentum *τῆς τῶν πολεμίων τροπῆς*. This term (as e.g. *κοιμητήριον*) received under the influence of Christian ideas a distinct meaning, and might denote the place of execution as well as of burial. It is used here in the latter sense. For, speaking of the graves of several other apostles, of Philip and of St. John in Hierapolis and Ephesus, Eusebius in his third book uses the words *κεκοιμηται* and *ἀναπαύεται*. The tombs in Rome are compared (ii. 25) with those in Asia Minor; and the sentence with which they are introduced (*ἐγὼ δὲ ἔχω δεῖξαι*) can only refer to the monuments erected over the last resting-place of the Apostles, 'the tombs of St. Peter and St. Paul, the one at the Vatican, and the other on the Ostian Way' (Lightfoot's Apostol. Fathers, Part i. S. Clement of Rome, vol. ii. Lond. 1890, p. 381).

V. Funk discusses Grundl's theory (*de interpolationibus ex S. Justinii philos. et mart. Apologia secunda expurgendis*, Augsburg 1891), according to which Cpp. 4—10 and 14 in the II. apology are later additions to the original writing of Justin. For, according to Eus. H.E. iv. 17 there followed upon cp. 2 of that apology *εἰκότως καὶ ἀκολούθως* an account of the insidious attacks which Crescens and other so-called philosophers made upon Justin. Accordingly Maran and Otto have transferred the whole passage (cpp. 4—8) from the place which it has in the MS. (Cod. Parisinus 450) after cp. 8, and have put it in their editions immediately after cp. 2. Grundl however infers that the passage is an interpolation; he considers that there is no real connection between cp. 2 and cp. 4; that the doctrine regarding the demons brought forward here does not agree with that which Justin taught, as attested by Irenaeus (v. 26, 2); that the doctrine regarding the *λόγος σπερματικός* appears here very different from the tenet of Stoic philosophers, and would hardly have been thus presented to the emperor Marcus Aurelius. The author further regards cpp. 9 and 10 as different in form and matter from the rest of the apology, and cp. 14 as not in keeping with the general plan of the work etc. On the other hand v. Funk maintains that the words *εἰκότως καὶ ἀκολούθως* do not necessarily imply that the one passage followed immediately on the other, but that Eusebius quoted from the apology the passages of historical interest, and passed over those of a didactic character. The reviewer points out that in the first apology passages are found which might appear quite as doubtful as those which Grundl supposes to be spurious in the second.

Heft II. and III. Belser discusses the theory of Brandt (put forward in the Report of the *K. Akademie der Wissenschaften, Wien, Ueber die Entstehungsverhältnisse der Prosaschriften des Laktantius u. des Buches de mortibus persecutorum*) that the author of de m. p. was a lawyer, resident at Nikodemia, probably a pupil of Lactantius who published his work anonymously in 314 or 315 A.D. The reviewer agrees with Brandt that Lact. Institutiones were published in 311, the year in which Galerius died; but the work de mortibus, he believes, was composed immediately after the last events related in it, namely the deaths of Prisca, the wife of Diocletian, and of Valeria, the wife of Galerius, who were executed at Thessalonica in October or November

314. The author of that book exults over the victory which the Church has just obtained, the terrible end of all her enemies, the destruction, root and branch, of the Jovian and Herkulian families. But he represents Constantine and Licinius as joint protectors of the Christians, and—for good reasons—makes no mention of the fact that the two rulers had fallen out, and had fought each other in two battles by Cibale, 8th October 314, and on the Mardian plain in Thracia. In the course of the years 315 and 16, Licinius had become estranged from, and hostile to, the Christians. De mort. was composed not later than December 314. The reviewer agrees with Brandt that the Epitome is a work of Lact., but differs from the latter in assigning its date not before, but after, de mort., when another persecution seemed impending through Licinius, 315—16. He shows the close similarity that obtains in regard to style, idiom, and character of the three works referred to, and considers it hard to believe that Lactantius, the celebrated rhetorician, should have, when composing the epitome, drawn upon 'the commonplace production' of his pupil. The passionate denunciation of the persecutors of the Church, the savage exultation over the end of Galerius (mort. pers. 33—35) and of Daia (49) are in keeping with the spirit of the undoubtedly genuine Institutiones (v. 9, 4 sq., espec. v. 11 and 12); the writer of the latter, and indeed the Christians generally, regarded the heathen emperors as satellites adversarii (Instit. v. 21, 1 sq.). The statement of St. Jerome (de vir. illustr. 80), 'habemus ejus (Lactantii)...de persecutione librum unum,' cannot be set aside. Nor does the chronology present any difficulties; Belser assumes that Lact. was born about 248 or 249 A.D., that he entered on his career as public teacher of rhetoric in Nikomedia about 288, and that 'extrema senectute magister Caesaris Crispi, filii Constantini, in Gallia fuit' (de v. ill. 80). Crispus was nominated Caesar in 317, and Lact. was close upon his 70th year when he proceeded to Trèves as 'tutor' to the prince. De m. p. he composed in his 66th year.

Heft II. (p. 294—303). Ehrhard discusses the value of the two papyrus fragm. in the Berlin Museum, edited by U. Wilcken, Leipz. 1891, which contain passages of the Pastor Hermæ—first column: 29 lines of Simil. ii. 7, Funk's edition p. 444—second column: the first few syllables of 23 lines of Simil. iv. 2, Funk p. 446. The most important passage as regards the text is the last sentence of Sim. ii., hitherto known only from the Aethiop. and two Lat. translations. Of the two latter the vulg. has the more faithful rendering, 'qui hoc enim senserit, poterit aliquid ministrare.' Pap.

ὁ γὰρ συνῆναι
τοῦτ[ο δὲ] συνῆ[σεται] καὶ διακοῖνῃσαι τι.

The author is of the opinion that the fragment is a witness to the accuracy of the traditional text. He assigns to the papyrus definitely an earlier date than Wilcken Diels, and Harnack have done, placing it in the third or fourth century, and considers it the oldest palaeographic witness to 'the integrity of the Pastor.' From the fourth cent. the parchment code took the place of the papyrus for biblical literature, as we may judge from the fact that the bishops Acacius and Euzoius of Caesarea (c. 363—70) had the papyrus MSS. of their celebrated library copied on parchment.

Belser (p. 332—338), in reviewing *Hand-Komment. z. N. Testam. III. Bd. 2 Abt. Hebräerbrief, Briefe des Petr., Jak. Judas, bearb. v. v. Soden, Freiburg 1890*, takes exception to the method by which the author endeavours to invalidate, as far as possible,

the external testimony to I. Ep. St. Peter, which is given by I. Ep. St. Clement, the Pastor Hermæ, Polycarpus, and Papias, as well as to remove the allusions, found in i. 8, ii. 7 sq., ii. 22 sq., v. 1, which refer to the personal intercourse the writer must have had with the Lord, and which prove him to have been an eye-witness of the facts recorded. The reviewer further disagrees with the statement that the Ep. shows signs of having been written during a persecution, in the full sense of the word, and later than the year 64. He lays stress on the passages viii. 3 sq. and x. 25 as establishing the traditional view that Ep. Hebr. was composed before the destruction of Jerusalem. He recognizes at the same time the merit of the exegetical portion of the Commentary.

In Heft III., p. 396—438, Funk gives a résumé of his work *Untersuchungen über die Apostolischen Constitutionen*, Rottenburg, 1891, and he maintains that the author of the Ap. Constit., whose identity with the compiler of the greater collection of Ignatian epistles is proved, was an Apollinarian and not, as Zahn supposed, an Arian. The theological tendency is expressed with greater distinctness in Pseudo-Ignatius than in Pseudo-Clement. The date of the latter he thinks can be fixed from the fact that the celebration of Christmas-day is mentioned (in the catalogue of holidays v. 13; viii. 33) and that Saturday is placed, as regards divine service and breaking of fasts, on a level with Sunday in the beginning of the fifth century. The Canones Hippolyti, handed down to us by Arabic MSS. of the 14th century, are not a work of the celebrated author whose name they bear, as Haueburg and Achelis supposed, but have been themselves derived from the eighth Book of the A. Constit.

IV Quartalheft contains a translation of Aristides' Apology from the Syrian text by Schönfelder (p. 531—57). Funk, *Die Abendmahlselemente*, by Justin (p. 648—59), discusses the theory put forward by Harnack, *Texte und Untersuchungen VII. 2*, p. 115—144 (1891) and *Theol. Litt. Zeits.* 1892, p. 373—378, that the practice of the early Church, as recorded by Justin Martyr, was to use in the Eucharist the elements of bread and water, not bread and wine. The question, Funk contends, depends upon the explanation of the passage Apol. i. 65—67. 'In two places, c. 65,' p. 170, and c. 67, p. 186, ἄρτος καὶ ὄλκω καὶ ὕδωρ are mentioned here as the elements, in the two MSS. Ottobianus and Parisinus. In the passage impugned by Harnack, c. 65, 178, *ἑστὴ προσφέρεται τῷ προεστῶτι τῶν ἀδελφῶν ἄρτος καὶ ποτήριον ὕδατος καὶ κρέματος*, the κρέμα may be explained as an epexegetical construction, 'water, namely water mixed with wine.' The difficulty of this construction does not justify H.'s proposal to strike out the word κρέμα altogether, nor does the fact that Dial. 69 and Apol. i. 54 ὄλκω is a later correction warrant the belief that this word was similarly introduced as an emendation into the original MS. in the two places mentioned above.

Review of Aug. Bludau, *De Alexandrinae Interpretationis libri Danielis indole critica*, Aschendorf. 1891, by Velter (p. 660 sq.). 'A work showing industry and critical acumen; of interest is the investigation into the manner in which the early Fathers have used either the Septuagint or Theodotion's translation; the latter is older than usually assumed, and dates from the first half of the second century.' C. MERK.

In No. 26 of the *Theologische Literaturzeitung* for 1892, O. v. Gebhardt reviews a catalogue (Athens, 1890, pp. 14, 340) of the MSS. contained in the monastery of St. John the Divine, Patmos.

It was compiled by Sakkelion thirty years ago, and supersedes the labours of Guerin (Paris, 1856) and Coxe (London, 1858). The library now contains 305 MSS. on vellum, 530 on paper, some of as late date as last century. There are few MSS. of great antiquity, as, even to the beginning of this century, it was the custom to burn worn and imperfect MSS.

Jahresberichte des Philologischen Vereins zu Berlin. June 1891.

LIVY BY H. J. MÜLLER.

I. Editions. *Titus-Livii, Narrationes*, by O. Riemann et J. Uri. Paris 1890. Contains in 69 extracts the most interesting narratives. The choice must be approved. *T. Livii libri i. et ii. rec.* Robertus Novák. Prag 1890. Too fond of assuming glosses and interpolations. *Livy, Book v.* by L. Whibley. Cambridge 1890. Makes an excellent impression. *T. Livii*. W. Weissenborn's edition, revised by H. J. Müller, Vol. 3, Part 2, Books viii.—x., 5th edition, Berlin 1890, and Vol. 4, Part 2, Book xxii., 8th edition, Berlin 1891. A great improvement on the last editions respectively. *T. Livii*. W. Weissenborn, 2nd edition by M. Müller, Part IV., Fasc. 2, Books xxxvi.—xxxviii. Careful and conscientious. Our uncertain and partial knowledge of the text of the 4th decade surrounds the textual criticism with difficulty.

II. Contributions to criticism and interpretation. (a) Dissertations. L. Winkler, *Die Dittographien in den Nikomachianischen Codices des Livius*. Part I. Wien 1890. We must distinguish four groups among the codd. of the 1st decade—viz. (1) V, (2) MW, (3) PFU, (4) RDLH. Groups (2), (3) and (4) go back to the same archetype. K. Niemeyer, *Zu Livius*, N. Jahr f. Phil. 1890. Various emendations. R. Novák, *Zu Livius*. Zeitschr. f. d. öst. Gymn. 1890. Various emendations. F. Gustafsson, *De Livii libro xxi. emendando*, Helsingfors 1890. His conjectures make the impression of inconsiderate

whims. H. Sauppe, *Variae lectiones*, Index schol. G.—S. Göttingen 1890. Three passages in Livy are handled viz. xxx. 43. 13, xxxiii. 18. 2, and xl. 42. 1. A. Luchs, *De Sigismundi Gelenii codice Liviano Spirensi commentatio*, Univ. Progr. Erlangen 1890. The MSS. of the 4th decade fall into two classes (1) M, (2) Bambergensis (B) and later ones (Φ). The Spirensis which G. used belongs to the 2nd class and is nearer to Φ than to B. (b) Scattered contributions consisting of conjectures by various scholars.

III. Writings of mixed contents. *Lexicon Livianum*. Partim ex Hildebrandi schedis confect F. Fügner. Fasc. 2. Lipsiae 1891. The praise due to Part I. must also be given to Part II. [*Cl. Rev.* V. 346]. W. Soltau, *Eine annalistische Quelle in Cicero de officiis* iii. W. S. f. Klass. Phil. 1890. The many excursuses in Cic. de Off. iii. on older Roman history are probably to be referred to Claudius Quadrigarius as authority who was also used by Livy, and the Polybian information in Books xxi. and xxii. has probably come through Claudius. J. Thirle, *Ueber Nachahmungen des Demosthenes, Thukydides und Xenophon in den Reden der Römischen Archäologie des Dionysius von Halicarnass.* Leipzig 1890. In this excellent dissertation the writer shows that the speeches of Livy and Dionysius are independent of one another. A. Nagl, *Ueber eine Parallelstelle bei Plutarch und Livius*. Zeitschr. f. d. öst. Gymn. 1890. Seeks to weaken the objections which the reviewer made [*Cl. Rev.* V. 346] against N.'s proposed insertion in the text of Livy (xxii. 10. 7) owing to Plut. Fab. 4. O. Moltzer, *Das 'Schöne Vorgebirge' in den Karthagisch-römischen Verträgen*. Commemorationes Fleckeisenianae, Leipzig 1890. Shows the identity of καλὸν ἀναρτήριον (Polyb. 3. 22. 5), with *Pulchri promunturium* in Liv. xxix. 27. 12, and of both with the present Räs Sidi Ali el Mekki. Livy has probably here used Polybius. Chr. Hülsen und P. Lindner, *Die Altiasschlacht*. Rom 1890 with a map. Agrees with Mommsen that the battle cannot have taken place on the left bank and that the account of Diodorus is the more trustworthy.

LIST OF NEW BOOKS.

ENGLISH BOOKS.

Aeschylus. Oresteia. Translated into English Prose, by Lewis Campbell, with an introduction. Post 8vo. 170 pp. Methuen. 5s.
Cicero. De Oratore. Book I. Translated into English with an introduction by E. N. P. Moor. Post 8vo. xxii, 108 pp. Methuen. 3s. 6d.
Die (C. M.). A first Latin Reader and Writer. Part 8vo. 202 pp. Sonnenschein. 1s. 6d.
Euripides. Alceste. Text, with translation, by R. W. Reynolds. 12mo. 86 pp. Hodder. 1s. 6d.
— Hercules Furens. A literal translation, by R. M. Thomas. Cr. 8vo. Clive. 1s.
Hume (M. C.). An introduction to Latin prose composition. 12mo. 154 pp. Simpkin. 1s. 6d. net.
Homer's Iliad. Book XXII. Text, with translation by R. W. Reynolds. 12mo. 46 pp. Hodder. 1s. 6d.

Horace. Odes. Books I and II. Text, with translation, by R. W. Reynolds. 12mo. 92 pp. Hodder. 1s. 6d.
Livy. Book IV. With notes, by J. Prendeville re-edited and partly rewritten, with a revised text, by J. H. Freese. 12mo. 156 pp. Bell & Son. 1s. 6d.
Macmillan's Latin Course. Second part. By A. M. Cook. 12mo. xiv, 420 pp. Macmillan & Co. 4s. 6d.
Ovid. Tristia. Book III. Edited by A. H. Allcroft, and F. G. Plaistowe. Post 8vo. Clive. 3s.
Ramsay (W. M.). The Church in the Roman Empire before A.D. 170. With maps and illustrations. 8vo. 494 pp. Hodder. 12s.

FOREIGN BOOKS.

- Aristoxenus von Tarent.* Melik und Rhythmik des klassischen Hellenismus. Band II. Bericht. Original-Text nebst Prolegomena von R. Westphal. Herausgegeben von F. Saran. 8vo. 16, cxxl, 110 pp. Leipzig, Abel. 20 Mk.
- Bishop (C. E.)* Verbals in -top in Sophocles. (2 parts.) S.-A. 92. 14, 29 S. 8vo.
- Bucherer (F.)* Die Diomedessage. Diss. Heidelberg. 81 S. 8vo.
- Bulle (H.)* Die Silene in der archaischen Kunst der Griechen. Diss. München 93. vi, 77 S. 8vo.
- Chronica minora*, collegit et emendavit C. Frick. I. Accedunt Hippolyti Romani praeter canonem paschalem fragmenta chronologica. 12mo. cccxvi, 637 pp. Leipzig, Teubner. 6 Mk. 80.
- Corpus inscriptionum atticarum consilio et auctoritate academiae litterarum regiae borussicae edidit.* Vol. II. Pars IV. Folio. Berlin, G. Reimer. 11 pp.
- [Inscriptiones atticae aetatis quae est inter Euclidis annum et Augusti tempora edidit U. Koehler. Pars IV. Indices continens composuit I. Kirchner. vii, 93 pp.]
- Dawmann (A.)* De Festo Pseudo-Philoxeni auctore. Diss. Jena 92. 48 S. 8vo.
- Eller (A.)* De Gnomologiorum Graecorum historia atque origine commentatio part. I. Pr. Bonn 93. 70 Spalten. 4to.
- Eudociae Augustae carminum reliquiae editae ab A. Ludwich.* 4to. 53 pp. Königsberg, Schubert & Seidel. 20 pf.
- Euripides.* Electra. Texte grec accompagné d'une notice, et de notes en français par Weil. 16mo. 107 pp. Paris, Hachette. 1 fr.
- Fischer (C. T.)* Untersuchungen auf dem Gebiet der alten Länder und Völkerkunde. Heft 1. De Hannonis Carthaginiensis periplo. 8vo. 134 pp. Leipzig, Teubner. 3 Mk.
- Fischer (J. N.)* Zu Horaz' zweitem Literaturbrief. Pr. Feldkirch 92. 32 S. 8vo.
- Fontes rerum byzantinorum sumptibus academiae caesareae scientiarum accuravit W. Regel.* Tome I. Fasciculus I. 8vo. xv, 182 pp. St. Petersburg. 3 Mk. 25.
- Galenii Pergameni, Claudii, scripta minora.* Recensuerunt J. Marquardt, J. Müller, G. Helmreich. Vol. III. *Περὶ αἰσθησῶν τοῖς εἰσαγομένοις. Ὁρασθ-βουλοῖς. Περὶ φυσικῶν δυνάμεων.* Ex recognitione G. Helmreich. 12mo. x, 257 pp. Leipzig, Teubner. 3 Mk.
- Ganter (L.)* Die Provinzialverwaltung der Triumvirn. Diss. Strassburg 92. 73 S. 8vo.
- Goetz (G.)* De Astraea Plautinae fragmentis commentatio. 4to. viii pp. Jena, Neuenhahn. 50 pf.
- Goumy (E.)* Les Latins (Plaute et Terence, Cicéron, Lucrèce, Catulle, César, Salluste, Virgile, Horace). 12mo. iii, 274 pp. Paris, Hachette. 3 fr. 50.
- Hegehnauer (L.)* Grundeigentum im öffentlichen Recht. Eine Studie aus dem Beginne der römischen Kaiserzeit. Diss. Tübingen 91. 56 S. 8vo.
- Helm (R.)* De P. Papinii Statii Thebaide. 8vo. 179 pp. Berlin, Mayer & Müller. 3 Mk. 60.
- Herthum (P.)* De Megalopolitarum rebus gestis et de communi Arcadam republica. (I.) Diss. Jena 93. 87 S. 8vo.
- Historia Apollonii regis Tyri.* Iterum recensuit A. Riese. 12mo. xx, 131 pp. Leipzig, Teubner. 1 Mk. 40.
- Josephi Flavii opera omnia.* Post J. Bekkerum recognovit S. A. Naber. Tome IV. 12mo. xlvii, 385 pp. Leipzig, Teubner. 3 Mk. 60.
- Jürges (P.)* De Sallustii historiarum reliquiis capita selecta. Diss. 8vo. 88 pp. Einbeck. 2 M.
- Kaufmann (N.)* Die teleologische Naturphilosophie des Aristoteles und ihre Bedeutung in der Gegenwart. 2te Auflage. 8vo. vi, 127 pp. Paderborn, F. Schöningh. 3 Mk.
- Lucas (J.)* Studia Theognidea. 8vo. 71 pp. Berlin, Heinrich. 2 Mk.
- Luschan (F. v.)* Die Tachtadschy und andere Ueberreste der alten Bevölkerung Lykiens. Diss. München 91. 23 S. m. 5 Abbild. u. 1 Tafel. 4to.
- Michaelis (A.)* Altattische Kunst-Rede. 8vo. 39 pp. Strassburg, Heitz. 80 pf.
- Mommsen (T.)* Le droit public romain. Traduit sur la 3ième édition allemande par P. F. Girard. Tome III. 395 pp. Paris, Thorin et fils.
- Nordström (V.)* Quaestiones Aristoteleae. II. 8vo. 42 pp. Helsingfors. 1 Mk. 20.
- Ravaissan (F.)* La Vénus de Milo. 4to. 116 pp. Plates. Paris, C. Klincksieck.
- Extract Mémoires de l'Académie des inscriptions et belles lettres. Tome 34, partie I.
- Roscher (W. H.)* Ausführliches Lexikon der griechischen und römischen Mythologie. Lieferung 24. 8vo. (Band II. columns 1025—1248). Leipzig, Teubner. 2 Mks. each.
- Supplement-Band 8vo. 10 Mks.
- Epitheta deorum quae apud poetas graecos leguntur, collegit, disposuit, edidit C. F. H. Bruchmann. viii, 225 pp.
- Rubensohn (O.)* Die Mysterienheiligtümer in Eleusis und Samothrake. I. Diss. Strassburg 92. 141 S. u. 1 Plan. 8vo.
- Schöne (A.)* Das historische Nationaldrama der Römer. Die Fabula praetexta. Rede. 8vo. 18 pp. Kiel, Universitäts-Buchhg. 1 Mk.
- Seitz (K.)* Die Schule von Gaza. Eine litterargeschichtliche Untersuchung. Diss. Heidelberg 92. 52 S. 8vo.
- Sigall (E.)* Platons Ethik im Dialoge Gorgias. Pr. Suczawa 92. 40 S. 8vo.
- Sorn (I.)* Der Sprachgebrauch des Historikers Eutropius. Ein Beitrag zur historischen Grammatik der lateinischen Sprache. 8vo. v, ii, 39 pp. Laibach. 1 Mk. 20.
- Suscmihl (F.)* Quaestionum Aristotelearum criticarum et exegeticarum pars II. Pr. Greifswald 93. 20 S. 4to.
- Tomaschek (W.)* Die alten Thraker. Eine ethnologische Untersuchung. I. Uebersicht der Stämme. 8vo. 130 pp. Wien, Tempsky. 2 Mks. 60.
- Extract: Sitzungsberichte der kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaft.
- Urkunden, aegyptische, aus den Königlichen Museen zu Berlin. Griechische Urkunden. Heft 4. 4to. (pp. 97—128). Berlin, Weidmann. 2 Mk. 40.
- Wachsmuth (C.)* Commentatio vernaculo sermone conscripta de Eratosthene, Apollodoro, Sosibio chronographis. Pr. Leipzig 92. 30 S. 4to.
- Wessely (C.)* Bemerkungen zu einigen Publicationen auf dem Gebiete der älteren griechischen Paläographie. Pr. Wien 92. 20 S. 8vo.
- Wilamowitz-Moellendorf (M.)* De tragicorum graecorum fragmentis commentatio. 8vo. 33 pp. Göttingen, Dieterich. 55 pf.
- Wipprecht (F.)* Quaestiones palaeopateae, cap. VI. Diss. Bonn 93. 67 S. 8vo.
- Zingerle (A.)* Zur 4ten Decade des Livius. 8vo. 28 pp. Wien, Tempsky. 70 pf.
- Extract: Sitzungsberichte der kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaft.